

# The Classical Review

MAY 1897.

## DISCOVERY OF A COLLATION OF THE LOST 'CODEX TURNEBI' OF PLAUTUS.

### I.

A GRYPHIUS edition of Plautus (8vo. Lyons 1540) in the Bodleian Library has on the fly-leaf this entry: 'Hae notae in margine sunt manu Francisci Duareni Juriscons. celeberrimi ex ueteri Codice.' The margins are filled with variant readings by another hand, one series of which (beginning with v. 730 of the *Pseudolus* and extending over the *Poenulus*, *Persa* and the first half of the *Rudens*) is distinguished (though not by any means persistently) by the mark *dr.* from another series marked (in the same desultory fashion) *poict.*<sup>1</sup> The source of the readings marked *dr.* (occasionally *du.* and *do.*, which I interpret 'D(o)uareni') is indicated by a note in the margin of *Pseud.* 730 *sqq.*: 'Ex fragmentis monast(erii) S. Columbae (leg. Columbae) Senon(ensis) urbis Adriani Tornebi,' that is to say, a fragmentary MS. belonging to the Library of the Benedictine Monastery of Sainte Colombe at Sens, in the department of Yonne, used by the French scholar Adrien Turnèbe (1512-1565, Professor at Paris from 1547 till his death).

These 'Douaren'-readings are extremely good readings. They agree with *B*, the best of the minuscule MSS. of Plautus, against *CD*, the MSS. which take the second and third place. Not infrequently they are right alone, or in company with *A*, the

Ambrosian Palimpsest, where *BCD* show an error or a lacuna. Here are a few samples:—

*Poen.* 770. Id nunc his cerebrum uritur.

(His cerebrum uritur *A*, hisce crebro auritur *CD*, *om. B*). (The Oxford copy has *his cerebrum utitur*, probably a miswriting of *uritur*).

*Poen.* 1355.

Numquid recusas contra me? Haud uerbum quidem.

(Haud uerbum quidem *A*, aduersum quidem *BCD*). (The Oxford copy has *had uerbum quidem*, which was clearly the reading of the Archetype of *BCD*).

*Pers.* 587. Aequom hic orat.

(Aequom hic orat *A*, aequo mihi corat *B*, aequo mihi curat *CD*). (The immediate original of *BCD* seems to have had *aequo mhi (mihi) corat*. The Oxford copy shows *aequo hic orat*).

*Pers.* 705.

Quodsemelarrripides Numquam eripides: em tibi.

(Eripides em tibi *A*, eripides *BCD*). (The Oxford copy has *eripides ea tibi*. This last part of the line was unknown till the discovery of the Ambrosian Palimpsest in this century).

<sup>1</sup> Presumably the readings of a MS. from Poitiers. This MS. clearly had the ordinary 'Italian text' of Renaissance MSS; and its readings are of no value. The other mark, I may add, is certainly *dr.* not *tr.* ('Turnebus,' 'Torn-').

*Poen.* 1019.

Ad messim credo, nisi quid tu aliud sapis.

(Nisi quid tu aliud sapis *A*, nisi quidem tua *BD*, deest *C*). (The Oxford copy has *nisi quidem tu aliud sapis*. The ending of this line too was unknown till the Ambrosian Palimpsest was found).

*Pers.* 762.

Nam improbus est homo qui beneficium seip accipere et reddere nescit.

(Accipere *B*, sumere *CD*). (The Oxford copy agrees with *B*).

*Rud.* 519.

Eas : easque res agebam commodum.

(The Oxford copy reads with *A* *Eas easque*, while *BCD* agree in *Das easque*).

Specimens of lacunae in *BCD* which are supplied in the Oxford copy, but for which the evidence of *A* is lacking, are :—

*Rud.* 738.

Nam altera haec est nata Athenis ingenuis parentibus.

Here *B* has *athenis in e tibus*, *CD* *athenis sine tibus*.

*Rud.* 417.

Si mox uenies *uesperi* (si mox ueni is *CD*, si mox uenis *B*).

*Rud.* 686. Edepol diem hunc acerbum.

*Rud.* 166.

Neque gubernator unquam potuit tam bene.

*Rud.* 312.

Ut piscatorem aequomst, fame sitique speque falsa (spesque falsa).

*Pers.* 205.

Sophoclidisca, di me amabunt. Quid me? Utrum hercle illis iubet (iubet).

When I add that the symbols for 'diverbiū' and 'canticum' occur at the beginning of some scenes in the Oxford copy, e.g. *Rud.* III. i. (Miris modis etc.) *DV*, *Pers.* II. v. (Paratum iam etc.) *C*, it will be sufficiently demonstrated that these marginal variants had their source in an actual MS. Further they seem to be free from conjectural emendation. At any rate, in various

passages where this comes in, there is express statement of the fact. For example, at the line last quoted, *Pers.* 205, the marginal annotation runs: *quid me. P(aegnium) utrum hercle illis iubet verum iuuat*, implying that *iubet* was the reading of the MS., for which a conjectural emendation *iuuat* is suggested. At *Poen.* 1355 (quoted above) the note is: *AG(orastocles) had verbum quidem app(arenter) haud verbum*. The actual reading of the MS. *had verbum* has been scrupulously preserved. It is unlucky that the distinguishing marks of the good series (*dr.*) and the inferior series (*poet.*) are so often omitted. Still one is seldom in doubt about the series to which a variant should be referred. When two variants are given, the first is the reading of the Poitiers MS., the second the 'Douaren' reading. Where only one is given, the character of the variant generally entitles us to ascribe it without doubt to the one or the other source. The most serious defect of the collation is that it has evidently been copied from a modern (presumably sixteenth century) original, and that many mistakes have been made in the copying. A reference to the kindred MSS. (*BCD*) however usually enables us to detect a clerical error of the kind.

We are thus, it seems to me, entitled to regard these marginal variants as a fairly reliable collation of the famous 'codex Turnebi' (*T*), a MS. whose immense importance for the text is well known to all Plautine scholars. The few *T*-readings of these four plays which we already know from the *Adversaria* of Turnebus, such as *Poen.* 977 *Punicast guggast homo*, 1033 *mgdiliz*, *Pseud.* 738 *hircum ab aliis* (*leg. alis*), *Rud.* 613 *fano meae uiciniae*, 724 *non licet <ita>*, all reappear on the margin of the Oxford copy. The same is true of some noteworthy readings of the 'veteres libri' of Lambinus, and the 'vetus codex' of Scaliger, e.g. *Poen.* 977 (quoted above), 1204 *addunt* (*Lamb. addant*), 1355 (quoted above), *Pers.* 239 at [*ita*] *uotita sum*, 843 *graphice*, *Rud.* 417 (quoted above), 418 *mane mulierem*, *Rud.* 613 (quoted above); so that this newly found collation pronounces for the genuineness of these hitherto suspected readings. Indeed there are some grounds for supposing that Scaliger, and possibly also Lambinus (cf. *Rev. Phil.* xix. 256), derived them from the marginal entries of this very volume, or of a volume annotated in precisely similar fashion. In *Poen.* 384 *T*, like *A* and *B*, seems to have had the right reading *impias*, *ere*, (*here*), *te*. (*Impia secreta CD*), but in the

margin of the Oxford copy we find *impias fere te*, so carelessly written as to look like *impias ferile*. The 'vetus codex' of Scaliger had *impias herile*! In *Poen.* 718-9 the Gryphius text offers:—

Ibique reliqua alia una fabulabimur.  
Equidem narrabo etc.

In the Oxford copy *una* is expunged, and in the margin *eadem* is written as a correction of *Equidem*, but without the usual stroke under the corrected word; so that a hasty reader, seeing *eadem* in the margin and a row of dots under *una*, might imagine that *eadem* was meant to be substituted for *una*. This is the reading of Scaliger's 'vetus codex': *alia eadem fabulabimur*! The Bodleian volume was certainly used by another Plautine scholar of France, namely Passerat. In a recent visit to the Bibliothèque Nationale, I found a Gryphius text of 1535 (Rés. p Y c 232) which had belonged to Passerat, and on whose margin that scholar had made a careful copy of the marginal annotations in the Bodleian Gryphius (of 1540). The relation between the two volumes is placed beyond doubt by the recurrence in Passerat's notes of entries like these: 'est in excuso an. 1540,' 'in alt. exc. an. 1540 a Gryphio,' 'in altero Gryphii,' as well as by the transcription of the variant for *Poen.* 63 as *qui*, whereas in the Oxford copy it is *quia*, clearly the right variant, with the last letter hidden by the initial letter of the next line. At the end of the volume Passerat gives the date of the completion of his task: 'an. 1557 mense Octob. ;' so that the entries in the Oxford copy must have been made at some time between 1540 and 1557. Douaren was at Paris from 1548 for a time, and it is conceivable that he obtained the collation from his friend Turnèbe and took a copy of it during that period. Unfortunately there seems to be no specimen of Douaren's handwriting in the Bibliothèque Nationale, so that it is impossible to be certain that the Oxford marginal entries are actually from Douaren's hand. The fact however that the note on the fly-leaf is in a different hand from the marginalia themselves is strongly in favour of this supposition. The Oxford volume bears two owners' names: 'Publii Coronae Taboroti' (i.e. Étienne Tabourot 1549-1590) and 'R. Belleau' (possibly Tabourot's friend, Remy Belleau 1528-1577, or a descendant). It passed into the Bodleian from the library of Bishop Barlow, died 1691, among whose books are several relics of French scholars

of the 16th century.<sup>1</sup> That this Gryphius text was at one time in the possession of P. Pithou is suggested by a note of Passerat's prefixed to an Aldine Plautus (Venice 1522) in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Rés. m Y c 371), a volume of which an account was recently given by M. Paul Le Breton<sup>2</sup> in the *Revue de Philologie* (1895, vol. xix. p. 255). Passerat has made it a receptacle for the collations of no less than nine MSS., of which he gives us a careful account in a prefatory note, and whose readings he distinguishes by different coloured ink. The marginal variants of his Gryphius copy he here describes as the collation of three MSS., taken from a Plautus, lent him by P. Pithou (Petrus Pithoeus nobis commodavit Plautum emendatum a capite ad calcem comparatione trium veterum librorum). He does not, however, say that the collation had been written by P. Pithou himself; and the writing in the Oxford copy (probably, as we have seen, Douaren's handwriting) is unlike P. Pithou's style of penmanship.<sup>3</sup> Indeed since P. Pithou was born in November 1539, he would be barely eighteen years old when Passerat transcribed the collation (Oct. 1557). The third MS. used (if the real number was three) may have been one containing the first eight plays in the ordinary 'Italian recension,' but this point I have not yet fully investigated. I see no ground for believing it to have been a MS. of any value.

A more important point to determine is the extent of the 'Codex Turnebi' or, as we may now call it, the 'Fragmenta Senonensia.' The good readings, normally marked 'D(ua)r(en)i,' in the Oxford volume extend, as I have said, from *Pseud.* 730 over the rest of that play, the whole of the two following, the

<sup>1</sup> One is an Aldine edition of Spartianus etc. (Auct. II. R. VI. 54), which formerly belonged to the Pithou library (cf. Boivin, p. 97). Another is a Dousa text of Plautus (Auct. S. 5. 21) which formerly belonged to Joseph Scaliger and is filled with his annotations (cf. de Larroque, p. 341). I hope to write about this latter volume on a future occasion.

<sup>2</sup> M. Le Breton has made a careful copy of this 'variorum' collation of Passerat, and was so obliging as to let me have the use of it for an edition of Plautus, which I am preparing. His copy has been of very great service to me in deciphering the entries in the Oxford volume. The discovery that the 'codex Turnebi' was a Sens MS. really belongs to him; for in his article in the *Revue de Philologie* he quotes from Passerat's Aldine the entry (at *Pseud.* 730): 'Ex fragmentis . . . urbis,' and calls attention to the fact that the subsequent variants are T-readings. The Oxford Gryphius, where the entry appears in full: 'Ex fragmentis . . . Adriani Tornebi,' removes the last possibility of doubt.

<sup>3</sup> I am indebted for this information, and for a great deal of other help, to the courtesy of M. Dorez of the Bibliothèque Nationale.

*Poenulus*, and *Persa*, and the first half of the next, the *Rudens*.<sup>1</sup> They appear also in certain parts of the *Bacchides*; from v. 35, the beginning of the play in the Palatine MSS., to about v. 80, from about v. 570 to about v. 650, and from about v. 810 to about v. 900 (e.g. v. 36 *fugiet Do[uar]*; v. 602 *oportet scutum integumentum improbus*; v. 887 *verbinast*). Douaren's collation thus makes us think of the 'fragmenta Senonensia' as a compact fragment containing the last part of the *Pseudolus* and nearly the whole of the three following plays, with loose leaves of the *Bacchides*, possibly inserted for security in some part of it. These leaves we may suppose to have been (1) a single leaf, perhaps the first of a quaternion, (2) two broad sheets, perhaps the second and third (i.e. the second, third, sixth, and seventh leaves) of another quaternion. It seems natural to imagine that Douaren, when he was about it, would have written out the full collation of the 'codex Turnebi'; but on the other hand we find in Turnebus' *Adversaria* (published in 1564) readings quoted from this codex (aliquot membranae quas aliquando habui) for passages of other plays, notably the *Casina*. It is possible that a marginal note in the Oxford copy for v. 75 of the *Menaechmi* comes from the good MS.: *alibi in alio codice inuenitur textus sequens 'Ni caditat leno modo.'*<sup>2</sup> And the variants for *Amph.* 342 (alias 'qui pugnis os exossas hominibus') and *Men.* 391 (bexae) belong to the better type of MSS. What parts of the 'codex Turnebi' the 'Duarenus' collation omits and how far the readings from the 'vetus codex' of Scaliger and the 'veteres libri' of

<sup>1</sup> This is the regular order of these plays in the Palatine family of MSS., and in the early printed editions.

<sup>2</sup> Douaren, or whoever was the writer of these marginalia, has stopped abruptly without finishing the passage, which ought to proceed 'adulescens, modo senex, Pauper, mendicus, rex, parasitus, hariolus.' He does the same with *Pseud.* 1051, writing merely *Ita ac triumphat*, and no more.

Lambinus supply the deficiency, is a question that demands a careful investigation.

Lastly, with regard to the relation of the 'codex Turnebi' (*T*) to the other minuscule MSS., the impression left on my mind after a study of the 'Duarenus'-readings is that *T* stood to *B* in the same relation as *B* to *CD*. *BCD*, I take it, are derived from an Archetype written in Capitals, *B* and the original of *CD* being immediate copies of a minuscule copy (*P*) of this archetype. *T* is not a copy of *P*, which had, for example, in *Poen.* 471 *lenutte* (*B*) or *lenuite* (*CD*), where the Oxford copy has *lenuile*, while Turnebus professes to have found in his codex the true reading *lenuile*; and whose scribe had left out deliberately or accidentally words and parts of lines, e.g. in *Poen.* 977 the (to him) unintelligible half-line quoted above, *Punicast guggast homo*. *T* comes however from the same archetype (in capitals) as *BCD* and seems in passages like *Poen.* 1355 (already quoted) to retain the exact text of the archetype unaltered. A good many corrupt readings, formerly ascribed, on the strength of the agreement of *BCD*, to the ancient archetype of the Palatine family of MSS., are now shown by this collation of Douaren to be mere mistakes of the immediate original of *BCD*.

This point however, like all the points raised in this article, demands a detailed inquiry, accompanied by a full presentation of the 'Douaren' readings. I hope to publish this with as little delay as possible. In the meantime, that students of Plautus may not have to wait for information about the more valuable additions to our critical apparatus, I propose to print at once the more important of the 'Douaren' readings for the five plays. The readings for the *Rudens* will be found specially interesting.

W. M. LINDSAY.

Oxford.

## LUCANUS.

AD CENSURAM W. E. HEITLAND, *Class. Rev.* FEBR. 1897, P. 25, sqq.

In fasciculo supra laudato p. 35 Lucani a me editi (Lugd. Bat. A. W. Sythoff) censura exstat Heitlandi Viri Doct. in qua haec verba invenio: I cannot find this (that Francken has used VU himself) directly

stated. Etsi hoc effici potest e Praefatione, tamen e re esse putavi, ne quod dubium superesset, diserte monere me inde a d. 18 Dec. 1886 usque ad 28 Martii 1887 et d. 1 Julii usque ad 31 Jul. 1889, utrumque



MS.: V (Voss, Lat. Q. 51) et U (Voss, Lat. Fol. 63) ipsum contulisse. Addo collationes meas non esse ulla parte secundum Steinhartum (cuius collatio prodiit in Hosii editione a. 1892) mutatas aut truncatas, ne iis quidem locis, ubi error commissus potuisset explicari. Idem factum in Montepessulano: dedi quae ante Steinharti curam editam ego ex M., familiares mei Dr. J. van Wageningen, et Dr. M. A. Kreling e Montepessulano Ashburnhamensi, Gemblacensi notavimus. Meae collationes testimonii vim habent non sunt consarcinatae nec contaminatae.

Hoc affirmare Heitlando fortasse non superfluum videbitur; de quibusdam locis, ubi discrimen est aut esse videtur inter Steinhartum et me, quaerit, nec sine causa, utri fidem habeat; hos subiungam; aliorum quoque interest scire.

P. 36. Luc. iii. 19 ego:

rumpentes stamina M. *i.e.* es et a posterior in rasura.

Hosius (sequens Stht.): rumpenti stamine M<sup>1</sup>, *i.e.* in rasura antea scriptum erat id quod dicit. Haec nota enim M<sup>1</sup>, significat lectionem primitivam nunc deletam et sub rasura latentem. Istiusmodi lectionum erasarum penes Steinhartum fides esto, qui codici liquorem adhibuit, aut melius affectum manu versavit. Cf. Praef. mea I. p. xii. Nihil est obscuri aut discriminis.

P. 37. Luc. i. 448.

Textus in mea edit.: demittitis, var. lect.: dimittitis VU.

Hosius in textu: dimittitis, var. lect.: demittitis V, itaque U (ex sil.) dimittitis, discrimen est igitur in V, cui ego dimittitis, Stht. demittitis adscribit. In collatione mea secundum Burmannianam facta supra de scripta est *i* rubra, itemque *i* nigra tinctura, *i.e.* V et U habent: dimittitis.

I. 463 crinigeros, post hoc voc. in var. lect. excidit: O.

De reliquis in VU dubiis consului Doct. S. G. de Vries, successorem Doct. W. H. du Rieu, isque, qua est humanitate, locos a me indicatos contulit maxima diligentia, litteras non tam scribens quam pingens. Vid. tabula adiecta.<sup>1</sup> Ex ea haec efficiuntur:

I. 120 mea ed. in var. lect. recte: *est addit U*; tacet Stht., *est* in textu Hosius om.

254 *vid. infra.*

580 *et medio* ego in textu, in var. lect. 'e medio A'; *e medio* recte in textu sine var. Hos. *Et* in meo textu haesit, quod doleo, e Weisianna, quam correctam operis dederam exprimendam.

604 attollensque ego in textu, in var. lect.: 'et tollens V', *i.e.* e silentio: attollensque U; Hos.: et tollens in textu, in var. lect.: 'attollensque U', *i.e.* ex sil.: et tollens V. Nihil differt.

633 ego in textu: viscera, in var. lect. recte: pectora V, pectore U; Hos. in textu: pectora, in Var. Lect.: pectore u (voluit: in ras. U); ex sil. sequitur pectora VU, non prorsus recte.

Denique 642 in var. lect. aliquid turbatum est. Vides Steinhartum, qui aetatem trivit in codicibus conferendis, non magis quam me vacasse errore. Qui ipsi codices contulerunt sciunt, quam sit difficile, praesertim ubi plures conferuntur, ab omni vitio cavere. Plerique diligentiam conferentis explorare non possunt; raro enim datur duas collationes a diversis collatoribus eodem fere tempore factas, ut in Lucano, inter se conferre.

'Curiosum' (a curious instance) sibi invenire visus est Heitlandus i. 254, ubi ego: furem VU, Hos.: ruentem V furem U *vid.* nota (1). Omnis haec 'curiosa' varietas in eo est, quod Stht. de V fallitur, ut cuius potest accidere; in quo facile est tragoedias excitare, praesertim si ipse codices non conferas.

Benevolus lector animadvertet ad v. 101 et 103 eadem vocabula *male* VU (Stht.) errore bis posita esse. Pertinent ad 101. Scilicet Steinhartus primus vidit in medio vocabulo quod est *mare* in utroque libro exstare non *r* sed *l*. Mirum Cortium in ed. 1726 hoc ipsum *male* contra omnes MSS., ut dicit, coniectura assecutum esse, id ipsum in duobus codd. postea inventum et tamen—falsum esse. Burmannus iam satis Cortium refutavit et nollem rursus *male* ab Hosio revocatum.

Antequam ad exegetica transeo, non abs

# <sup>1</sup> LUCANI PHARSALIA I.

	Voss. Lat. Q. 51. (V).	Voss. Lat. Fol. 63. (U).
I. 120 permissum est <i>an</i> perm. [est]	Permissu ducibus	<sup>est</sup> Pmissu ducib; (est m. 2)
254 ruentem <i>an</i> furem	furentē	furentē
580 et medio <i>an</i> e medio	e medio	emedio
604 et tollens <i>an</i> attollensque	Et tollens	Attollensq;
633 pectore <i>an</i> pectora <i>an</i> viscera	pectora	pectore (e <i>in</i> ras)
642 nulla sine, nulla cum, <i>an</i> ulla (s. l.)	nulla cum lege	nulla sine lege

(DR. S. G. DE VRIES.)

re erit animadvertisse codices AF, aliosque ab Hosio passim inspectos in meum apparatus non receptos esse, quia parum noti et raro adhibiti essent. In notis codicum autem A habet diversam significationem apud Hosium et me. Nota illa apud Hosium significat *Adnotationes*, scholia quaedam in cod. Bernensi xxxv ab Usenero collata et ad Commentum adhibita, quae in Vossianis quoque VU et Berol. exstant, de quo (quod virum, etiam doctum fugisse non mirum est) exposuit Usenerus ad comm. p. viii. Mihi et doct. P. Lejay (ed. 1<sup>a</sup> libri Par. 1894) A est Ashburnhamensis, isque usus litterae A facile recipietur, quod *Adnotationes* descriptae ex codd. exstantibus, scholiis inde aliquando editis, exiguum pretium habebunt.

Gravis calamitas, si Heitlandum audimus, imminet criticae emendatrici. Nam quia duae sint familiae codicum, lectiones in omnibus codd. similes poetae manum repraesentare dicit; fieri non potuisse ut mendum idem casu in utramque perveniret. Est haec quaestio non tam nova quam parum explorata in universum; quisque editor habet suam de ea re opinionem; pertinet illa ad ipsa elementa criticae disciplinae, sed tam simplex plerisque videtur, ut operae pretium non habeant de ea data opera in proemiis editionum disserere. Si Heitlandus vere statuit, omnia opera, quae pluribus codicibus in summa re non diversis inter se prodita sunt, exenta erunt e provincia emendatricis criticae, cuius dignatio et aestimatio valde imminuentur; adhibebitur enim, si forte conceditur, Velleio Paterculo, Apuleio, Silio, ceterum diplomatica in locum emendatricis succedet, palaeographia, quatenus frequentia vitia ad classes redigit et probabilitatem erroris ostendit, amandari poterit, Dindorfii, Gronovii, Valckenaeiis, Porsonis raro opus erit; dura lex, sed lex.

Interim aliquot tamen opportunitates exerceendae conjecturalis criticae superesse Heitlandus fatetur. Quae in utraque classe ( $\mu$  et  $\phi$ ) adsunt debent *non nisi gravissimis causis* mutari p. 42<sup>c</sup>. Quaedam igitur corrupta sunt. Factum est igitur ut in ambas familias idem mendum penetraret, raro, sed factum. Sed quod *potuit* semel fieri, potuit saepius.

Ubi rerum testimonia adsunt, verbis non opus est. Num consensus codicum in Ciceronis orationibus, ut hoc utar, vacat vitio? Ab posse ad esse valet consequentia. Quod in bene multis operibus factum videmus, non negari debet in ullo fieri potuisse.

Sed tamen rationi credendum est; *demonstrare* se putat vir doctissimus vix aut ne vix quidem mendum potuisse irrepere, cedat

demonstrationi *probabilitas*, si modo demonstratum erit id quod demonstrandum erat.

Duae familiae paulum differunt, ergo continent manum auctoris. Quae illa est demonstratio? Sunt similes inter se, habent igitur eandem originem. Rectissime. Sed accedere aliquid debet: ea origo est manus poetae aut poetae proxima.

Unde hoc efficies? Codices sunt optimi, fateor, nemo labore collationis me magis ostendit, se eos magni facere; sed supra aetatem Carolingicam non adscendunt. Est inter poetae aetatem sive primam editionem Pharsaliae et antiquissimos nostros codices intercapedo octo saeculorum, quid factum sit, non scimus. Facile et gratis sumitur, quomodo e manu primi editoris provenerint volumina, sic ad medium aevum pervenisse. Me iudice ipse contextus ostendit naevos tot tantosque, ut magnopere de eo dubitandum sit.

Etsi successio codicum ultra saec. ix. nos fugit, tamen quaedam de fati librorum ex aevo antiquo nobis sunt tradita.

Gellius ii. 3, 5 miraculi instar memorat volumen exstitisse aetatis Vergilianae, i.e. 200 annorum; si non ultra ducentos annos codices servati sint, per octo saecula habemus iam quatuor codicum aetates. Intentissima cura amanuensis vitia praeverti non possunt. Queritur Cicero, admodum mendose codices scribi.

Sed aberrandum non est. Palimpsestus Romanus et Neapoli-Vindobonensis, scripti saec II—V, contextum habent, quo hodie nolles uti. Quae causa est igitur, cur existimemus quos hodie habeamus codices liberos corruptelis traditos esse? Contrarium probabile est. Nihil ex duarum familiarum magna similitudine inter se demonstrari potest nisi ante saec. ix. exstitisse recensionem, nostris codicibus fere similem. Quam antiquus fuerit communis ille fons, definiri non potest. In altera ex his propagine omissi sunt versus, qui in communi fonte aderant, quosque non improbabile est tanquam dittographias antiquissimas fuisse notatos.

Ex prima antiquitus editione tanquam fonte rivuli in omnes partes emissi sunt. Bibliopolae ut satisfacerent empturientium desideriis magnum numerum exemplorum conficiendum curabant, nec erant vulgares lectores valde studiosi emendatae lectionis. Apparet e Martiale xiv. 194 et palimpsestis. Non pacto aut convento evanescent vocabula, et tamen ea videmus quasi communi consensu expelli e consuetudine; in libris eligendis et reiiciendis valuerunt aequae ludibria temporum. Quae sequuntur reliqua a

coniectura pendent. Nempe ex hac fluctuatione ac varietate maior stabilitas nata esse potest, quomocunque tandem, sive Sosii sive Aristarchi alicuius opera sed ea non mansit semper. Ultimo enim imperii Romani saeculo modesta opera virorum doctorum et clarissimorum Horatii et aliorum auctorum emendationes confectae sunt. Quomodo tamen factum sit, ut una quaedam aut, si forte, duae tales emendationes omnes reliquas obscuraverint, iuxta cum ignorantissimis ignoro. Sed ut verborum sic librorum vetus interit aetas. Nec ulla causa est cur statuamus permagnum fuisse numerum codicum, qui ex antiquitate ad medium aevum salvus evaserit.

Ut res se nunc habet, non est cur aut Heitlandus e modo traditionis contendat Lucanum integrum, aut ego corruptum totum ad nos pervenisse. Hoc ex ipsa ratione carminis effici debet, prudenter et sine praeiudicio exploranda. In quo ecquid effecerim iudicium integris iudicibus relinquo. Non mihi conscius sum, me prurigne novandi motum esse; dum mea scripta considero, tam subinde obrepit cogitatio, num quaedam male affecta iniuria defenderim, quam altera, num emendatio proposita digna fuerit, quae cunctorum oculis subiceretur; de necessitate correctionis tentandae raro etiamnunc dubito.

Quidquid est, interpretatio carminis fundamentum erit critices. Admodum deprecor, ne Heitlandus me magistri cuiusdam partes stolidae arrogantiae affectare dicat. Nusquam fere quidquam tanquam non latinum damnavi, hoc tantummodo quaerens, num tradita forma loci talis esset, ut intellegi et placere posset aequalibus poetae, quorum consuetudinem litterarum luce collustratam satis novimus. In quo non tanti facio duo momenta, quae Heitlandus cum plerisque urguet.

1. We must never forget that the poem before us is the work of an immature genius, Heitl. p. 42.

Iure, sed quae inde consequantur, diligenter est definiendum. Primo non erat puer sed adolescens 20 annorum poeta cum priorem partem carminis conficeret, quam in Neroneis A.D. 60 recitavit, natus A.D. 39; alteram, libros iv.-x., composuit inter annos aetatis 21-24. Eae proprietates, quae faciunt poetam, celeres ingenii motus et phantasia, in adolescente omnino dominantur magis quam in viro; juvenilis aetas non parit per se obscuritatem; fervor ingenii suggerit vocabula grandia et luxuriam figurati amplique sermonis; inde vaga facile nascitur oratio, dum metaphorae sunt frequentes et crebrae et non elaboratae. Fervore ingenii, quod

modo arripuit iuvenis poeta, mox nondum perfectum mittet, nova phantasia motus. Inde saepe exultat oratio potius, quam incedit et vincula membrorum desiderantur. Ceterum eligit poeta sermonem, quo sensus mentis facillime effundat, i.e. patrium suum, qui tanquam naturae donum fuit facile et pullulat. Obscurus esse potest iuvenis poeta inventorum granditate et affluentia, peccare in linguam ex inopia et ignorantia sermonis non magis potiusve iuveni accidit quam viro. Iuvenes videbis facilius saepe et celerius loqui quam viros; verba eis affluunt. Si qui cum sermone luctari videntur, non sunt potissimum iuvenes. Quia Lucanus adolescens aut iuvenis est, non propterea debet durus aut ambiguus esse.

2. (The poem) was confessedly transmitted to later times in an unfinished state.

Non est id sine exceptione verum: tres libri sunt. Quod si quaeritur, num inter hos et septem reliquos ad nitorem et perfectionem magnopere intersit, valde equidem affirmare vereor; oratio Catonis in priore parte non est magis experta cohaerentiae quam Pompeii in altera, enumeratio Galliae copiarum aequae dissoluta in priore quam regionum Thessaliae in altera. Pluribus in hac brevitate supersedeo. Sine dubio emendaturus erat poeta postremos libros, ut Vacca putat, sed hoc quoque me iudice certum, illum experturum fuisse primum impetum in poesi vulgo optimum esse. Si quis existimat correctum a poeta carmen perspicuitate multo superius fuisse futurum, contendit aliquid quod collata priore eius parte admodum controversum est.

Aliud est huic affine, quod Heitlandus tamen non significare puto; volo editionem ex volumine poetae festinanter scripto et, ut fit, interdum mutato, factam ab editore manus auctoris aut amanuensis fortasse non satis gnaro utique ad errorem proclivo; inde mendae nasci potuerunt omnia futura exemplaria inquinantes. De hoc genere alibi actum, sed sequitur ex his quoque, fata Pharsaliae omnino talia esse, ut nulla causa sit, cur patienter pro genuinis accipiamus quidquid nobis apponitur. Equidem non praeditus sum stomacho tam capaci. Lib. i. 461 dicuntur Druidarum 'animae—capaces | mortis.' Ut *capaces* defendat Doct. Heitlandus provocat ad versionem: able to contain or receive death = ready for death. Non video quid 'capax mortis' sit aliud nisi 'qui capiat mortem.' Ipsa quidem mors non transit in animum, sed notio mortis capax mortis animus est: *satis magnus* ad mortem tenendam; is qui eum habet mortem animo *concepit*;

est ea laus philosophi; Heitlandus ut hoc redarguat interpretatur 'able to contain or receive death = ready for death.' Mihi illud *able to receive* inesse vocabulo non videtur; *capax* pertinet opinor ad 'capacitatem' non ad 'celeritatem'; et tamen verba conversa admodum blandiuntur. TC. v. 453 'nemora alta remotis | incolitis lucis' (ego: 'remotos lucos'). Heitland: Ye dwell in the depth of woodlands among the retired sacred groves.' Habemus poetam pro interprete. Credisne quia ornatis verbis periphrasis concipi possit, propterea sanam esse traditam lectionem? Egregie noverunt et Heitlandus et Haskinsius artificium poeticae orationis, est versio eorum quasi fragmentum Miltoni aut Wordsworthi; ego contendo: 'versio semper est inversio.' Sententia primitiva speculo mentis repercutitur, sed interpres, qui alia lingua *i.e.* alio instrumento utitur, e suo pecu quaerit verba affinia, grandia saepe et elegantia, non opinor quin vulgaribus possit uti, sed discipulorum causa, qui sic conciliantur poetae. Interim multa in duabus linguis vocabula non se plane 'tegunt,' quod aiunt; invito interprete excidit aliquid quod vix continet, umbram dicam an colorem, primitivae sententiae; et facilius eo aberratur, si aliquot verba inseruntur ex animo interpretis et offeruntur lenocinia verborum mutata sententia. Nolo reprehendere, sed haec ad defensionem traditae lectionis non sufficiunt.

Pauca ad defensionem mearum emendationum addo.

P 37 'Parvum (subst.) sanguinis' I. 128 defendit H. damnat meum *paulum s.*, quia magnus Thesaurus latinitatis in Germania qui fortasse exemplum aliud praebere possit, nondum prodiit (rusticus expectassem), et quia fieri possit, ut vulgaris consuetudo sic locuta fuerit. Non admodum probabile ubi agitur de vocabulo usitato per aetatem litterarum luce collustratam.

I. 429 Varietas lectionis in M satis implicata non potest clarius indicari, et ipse H. mea compendia recte intellegens reapse ostendit me iustis desideriis satisfacere. Mea annotatio de *foedere* omissa est.

P. 38 I. 456 librum H. obicit me MS. P laudare, h. l. qui nullus ad hunc librum mihi praesto fuerit. P = Proverbia. Cf. indiculus praemissus.

I. 16 Dies medius flagrantibus aestuat horis. Non satis videor perspicuus fuisse. Num post verba: 'medius dies flagrat' interrogabit aliquis: quando? Si talis quaeatio non est supervacanea, *horis* recte se habet.

102 'Nec patitur conferre fretum (duo

maria).' Caesar et Pompeius conferuntur cum mari Supero et Infero, quae aliquamdiu Isthmo quodam Messanae erant separata inter se; tanquam Isthmus ille, Crassus socerum et generum, *i.e.* duo freta separaverat. Primum sepono ab H. allatum ii. 435 qui locus minime convenit. Porro ut Benteianum *gradum* (pro: fretum) defendam, animadverto notionem *duorum*, non unius freti, necessariam esse, sine qua comparatio claudicet. Magis etiam *fretum* alienum est, quia id non collectivum est, nec impetum significat aut simile quid abstractum. Duo erant olim freta separata, *i.e.* Pompeius et Caesar. Duo erant olim freta (gulfs) ad mare Superum et Inferum. Inficetum non tantum est, sed testatur ignorantem verae sententiae, si fretum dicitur conferri cum gladio; gladio numquam tanquam intervallo separantur pugnantes. Non probo: conferre fretum is a figurative application used of two seas meeting face to face with their waters. Egregie Benteleius *gradum*. Exiguum spatium inter duos gladiatores gladio decertantes et extento pede in statu permanentes comparatur cum aggere (isthmo) inter duo maria.

115 *Furentem* patrem et virum retinere a certamine dicitur melius esse quam *furentes*, while (Julia would) hold them (father and husband) back one by one, work on their feeling separately. Nimis acute! Ita etiam iudico de defensione lectionis '*discussa fides*' (119). De arcu cum quo amicitia comparetur secundum Heitlandum nec vola est nec vestigium. *Discutere* est: '*quaquaversus* pellere' hoc negligitur.

186 *Ingens* est quod vulgarem modulum superat et eo horrorem, metum aut admirationem incutit. Quanto aptius amoris h. l. significatio (lucens) quam illud vagum et vacuum *ingens*; eo loco praecipue versus et de patria quidem: 'lucens visa duci Patriae trepidantis imago.'

262 *Mens* iv. 704 est animi affectio (Stimmung), vii. 183 abstracte dicitur: 'mentis tumultus' ut dicimus 'corporis dolores.' Ubi de singulorum animis agitur, pluralem videbis usurpatum vii. 180, al.—Schol. Oudend. ut haec extricaret, bis ponit *addunt*, quia optime intellegebat vel post logicam periodi constructionem nexum obscurum esse.

294 sq. 'Iam carcere clauso' Heitlandus dicit esse ablativum loci. Abundat igitur *clauso*? Immo *clausus iam* (etiamtunc) in stabulo equus impatiens iam est morae. Cum *clauso* minime iungi potest *iam*. Hoc fieret recte, si carceris claudendi actio soleret *sequi* ('wenn der carcer schon geschlossen ist.')



*Iam*, opinor, est maturata actio: iam ante iustum tempus equus trepidat.

316 Si erravi defensio Heitlandi utique placere mihi non potest: much of Lucan's rhetoric is in bad taste. Non comparatur Pompeius cum pusione.

372 Quidquid quis vult harioletur numquam tamen ostendet non esse absurdum (serio dictum) 'necesse mihi est posse' (debeo posse).

407 *Monocum* pro *Monoei* ('tuta prohibet statione Monocum'), invitus ipse, defendit Heitlandus allato vi. 503, ubi tellus *prohibet* lunam fraterna imagine i.e. lunam privat sole.

432 *Pererrare* potest, secundum analogiam aliorum cum *per* compositorum, absolute usurpari sed alio significato quam qui h. l. aptus est, nempe cum notatur: ad finem usque.

486 'Curia et ipsa.' Wanton change! Heitlandus; interim Bauerus mihi assentitur. Sic supra quoque (333) *tandem* contra H. Curia et ipsi patris dicitur si patres aliud quid sunt quam curia.

544 'Induxere sibi noctem Mycenae' 'far the better' (is the vulg. *ducere*). Nempe si diceretur 'trahunt post se noctem' aut 'sensim ad se ducunt,' quomodo est apud Stat. Ach. ii. 21 ubi de Seyro insula ex oculis navigantium sensim discedente 'ardua ducere nubes' incipit—Seyros.' Sed Mycenae prae horrore, ut homo faciem tegit, sic induit caliginem.

555 Mare 'summum implevit Atlanta' defendit Heitlandus: 'implevit = rose to the top of it.' Hoc (sit venia verbo) non est *vertere* sed *substituere* aliud vocabulum. Permittamus hyperbolen Lucano, sed *implere* est: congerere aliquid in rem cavam; quod non cadit in cacumen montis.

600 'Revocare imaginem deae flumine' non recte illustratur Vergiliano 'victu

revocare vires,' hae abisse et deinde redire cogitantur, Deae imago non fingitur aufugisse. Munus sacerdotum Cybeles erat purgare imaginem fluvio Almonae h. e. *renovare*. Praeterea ipsi sacerdotes ibant, non revocabant; abeuntes revocamus, non abductos et inanima.

Nolo plura afferre ne intemperantius spatio abutar. Sit tamen locus illustrandae metaphora, quae est ii. 140-3, ubi caedes Sullana comparatur cum sectione medici modum excedente: 'excessit medicina modum nimiumque secuta est qua morbi duxere manum,' ubi libri *manus*. Facete dolet Heitlandus ne hoc quidem sibi relictum solatium, nam ex Augustino CD. iii. 27 me adscivisse *manum*. Obiter animadvertatur ne antiquam quidem auctoritatem sufficere Heitlando, nisi cum codd. Lucani conveniat. Sed ad rem accedo. Quid est 'manus sequitur medicinam' (ut vulgo), nisi manus persequitur, efficit, curationem, consecratur loca morbida et quae curatione indigeant. Hoc non est quod dictum est superiore versu 'excessit medicina modum.' Ita manus medici suo officio fungitur. Potestne hoc nimis facere? In altera lectione sententia est medicina i.e. sectio, amputatio noxiorum, veluti carcinomatum, producta est pro facultate aut fastu operantis. Amputatio extenta est. Manus occupata semel in amputando non quievit, sed successu gaudens et peritia ostentanda etiam vitalia attingit.

De orthographia fortasse Heitlando satisfacet praefatio vol. ii. Alterius Vossiani (U) quam desiderat imaginem supeditabit fasc. 12 operis 'Palaeographie des Class. Lat.' ed. CHATELAIN, qui paucos ante dies prodiit.

C. M. FRANCKEN.

TRAIECTI AD RHENUM,  
M. Aprili, 1897.

#### THE DATE OF TYRTAEUS.

It may perhaps be expected by readers of the *Classical Review*, and by Mr. Macan, that I should state here, whether I am convinced or moved by the observations on my treatment of this subject, which he has done me the honour to make (*supra* p. 11). To the proposition which formed the base or kernel of my previous paper (vol. x. p. 269), that the orator Lycurgus associated the story of Tyrtaeus with the Messenian war of the

fifth century (circa 464-454 B.C.), Mr. Macan gives a single paragraph, and concludes that the contrary is manifest. It would seem at this rate that I ought to have little difficulty in recognizing my mistake; and silence could hardly be taken otherwise than as an ungracious acknowledgment. As a fact, the paragraph leaves me. (I say it with all respect) precisely where I stood before. It does not affect, because it does not touch at

all or pretend to touch, that part of Lycurgus' exposition, by which, as I thought and think, his opinion on the date of Tyrtaeus is made clear. The paragraph deals only with another part, which by itself would prove nothing precise upon the point, being dependent for its chronological definition on that part which the paragraph ignores.

But as the purpose of discussion is to promote agreement, and not to accentuate differences, let me first note with pleasure the impression which has evidently been made upon Mr. Macan by my remarks on the impossibility of assigning to the date of the supposed early 'Messenian wars', and to an origin in Sparta at that time, the poetry which bears the name of Tyrtaeus. For it should be observed that, in this respect at least, all of it stands on the same footing. In language, form, and style all the extant fragments are similar, nor is there (so far as I am aware) the slightest indication that the fourth century B.C. or any other age, claimed to possess any 'Tyrtaeus' of a different quality,—that is to say, any Tyrtaeus which, as a matter of fact, could have been composed for the Lacedaemonian public, or popular among Lacedaemonians, in 680 B.C. or anywhere near that date. Of all important Hellenic peoples the Lacedaemonians were, according to general testimony, the last to acquire such a diffused popular culture of the intelligence as would be needed for the general appreciation of literature cast in foreign forms and a foreign dialect. The very passage of Lycurgus, which we are to consider, shows that, even down to the fourth century, that great classical literature, which ruled in Athens and elsewhere, had still no general vogue in Lacedaemonia, and that the public there, in spite of Tyrtaeus and his educational reforms, still went, in 'the poets' recognized by Athens, little beyond the Lacedaemonian school-book, the compositions of Tyrtaeus himself. In the early part of the seventh century, if the average warriors of Lacedaemonia took interest (which may be doubted) in any poetry at all, the military songs which they heard and sang must have been songs in their own language, something resembling in style, but with more of local colour and archaism, the most 'Laconian' of the fragments attributed to Alcman, or the fictitious Laconian of Aristophanes. That then, or for many generations later, they cheered their fights and watches with classical elegiacs, we should believe as soon as that 'Come if you dare, our trumpets sound' was a favourite in the camp of Robert Bruce. If Tyrtaeus flourished in 680 B.C., or near

that time, then what Strabo and Pausanias knew as his works were all, on the face of them, spurious—a conclusion which there would be no difficulty in accepting. Indeed, Strabo at least was aware that the genuineness of his quotations might be questioned, and makes some remarks on the subject; which however show, as might be expected, an imperfect conception of the arguments which should be brought to bear. Before his time it had become practically impossible that, by the learned of Graeco-Roman society in general, the question should be seen in a true light. We will return to this presently.

If the alleged works be spurious, it makes, so far as concerns the authenticity of what is called the 'history' of the early Messenian wars, little or no difference, whether we do or do not suppose 'the real Tyrtaeus' to have lived in the age to which these wars are assigned. The claim of that 'history', to be better accredited than other legends or traditions respecting times before continuous record, has hitherto rested, not on the name or story of Tyrtaeus, but on the supposed existence, in this one instance, of these wonderfully early documents. If the framers of the story had some genuine documents, then they, or their authorities, might well have had others of equal authenticity. But if Tyrtaeus, however real a person, left nothing properly certified except his name, which served as a peg upon which to hang sundry forgeries, then we cannot hope to win trustworthy information by sifting the poetic fables which gathered around it and them.

But the hypothesis of forgery is one which, at this stage, it would be premature to entertain. *Prima facie*, and until the contrary is proved, the works of Tyrtaeus, presented to us with the invariable statement that they were composed for Lacedaemonians, and conquered the admiration of the Lacedaemonian public, are themselves evidence that Tyrtaeus lived at a time when such works could have had this origin and history. Our business is therefore to examine, and to examine without prejudice, the statements of our authorities on the date of Tyrtaeus the man, and to see whether they really support that early date which would raise a difficulty, and call in the hypothesis of forgery as an explanation. This ground we will not now traverse again, but will turn at once to the cardinal authority, the passage of Lycurgus (*Leocrat.* §§ 102-109). I am still unable as ever to see how that passage can be understood at all on any other supposition than that Tyrtaeus, according to

Lycurgus, lived and composed in the fifth century B.C.

The passage, of which a complete version is given in my previous paper, shall here be recapitulated briefly. It begins with a reference to Homer, to the public adoption of his works by the Athenians, as evidenced by the legal establishment of the recitations at the Panathenaea, and to the improvement in Athenian character which thereupon ensued. To this cause is attributed the excellent spirit displayed by Athens in the delivery of Hellas from the Persians, and in particular at the battle of Marathon. Such, continues the orator, were the Athenians of that age that the Lacedaemonians themselves, being at war with the Messenians, took a leader from Athens in the person of Tyrtaeus, who not only brought them victory, but also aided them in framing an improved education for their youth, based upon the teaching of his own patriotic poetry in elegiacs, from which a long extract is cited. So efficient was this poetry in stimulating the spirit and patriotism of the Lacedaemonians, that they disputed with Athens the 'hegemony' or leadership in Hellas.

That part of the original, which corresponds to my last sentence, runs as follows:

οὕτω τοίνυν εἶχον πρὸς ἀνδρείαν οἱ τοῦτων (the poetry of Tyrtaeus) ἀκούοντες, ὥστε πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν περὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίας ἀμφισβητεῖν. εὐκός τ' αὖ γὰρ κάλλιστα τῶν ἔργων ἀμφοτέροις ἦν κατεργασμένα. οἱ μὲν γὰρ πρόγονοι τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐνίκησαν οἱ πρῶτοι τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἐπέβησαν, καὶ καταφανῆ ἐποίησαν τὴν ἀνδρείαν τοῦ πλοῦτου καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν τοῦ πλῆθους περιγεγενημένην. Λακεδαιμόνιοι δ' ἐν Θερμοπύλαις παραταξάμενοι ταῖς μὲν τύχαις οὐχ ὁμοίως ἐχρήσαντο, τῇ δ' ἀνδρείᾳ πολὺ πάντων δύνεγκαν.

These are the words to which Mr. Macan, in the paragraph which he gives to 'The Date of Tyrtaeus,' confines his remarks, and of which he says, very truly, that they do not demand for Tyrtaeus a date after the Persian wars. But neither do they demand a date before them. Taken by themselves, they leave for the date so wide a choice, as to be almost insignificant upon the question. We learn from them only that the time, when Tyrtaeus, as previously narrated, established his works as the material of education in Lacedaemonia, was before the time when Sparta 'contended against Athens for the hegemony'; and not so long before (I think we must add) but that, at the time of the 'contention', the national performances of the Lacedaemonians might be attributed mainly and essentially to his reforms. This upward limit is vague, but not absolutely

indefinite. An educational force or an educational system, however permanent, could not naturally be cited as the main and true cause of what was done, by the people subject to it, at a particular epoch, if at that epoch it had been acting for more than a moderate space of time, a generation, let us say, or two at the most. With lapse of time the effect of this single cause must become so entangled with those of other causes, that to trace so precise and particular a connexion would be irrational. The English character, and therefore all the acts of England, are deeply affected to this day, and long will be, by the educational revolution of the sixteenth century, the diffusion of Protestantism and of the English Bible. Yet no one could reasonably say that the Reformation showed its effect in the stand made by England against Napoleon. On the other hand the stand against Philip, and the formation of the Puritan party, of course could and would be properly traced to this particular cause. This would give us for Tyrtaeus some sort of a *terminus a quo*, and one which, vague as it is, would scarcely admit the seventh century, to say nothing of 680 B.C. But what is the *terminus ad quem*? When was it that the Lacedaemonians 'contended against Athens for the hegemony'? I suppose that by a liberal interpretation, without actual violence, the words might apply to almost any time from (say) the middle of the sixth century to near the middle of the fourth, the age of Lycurgus himself. I took them and take them still (for reasons which will presently appear) to refer to the last half of the fifth century, the Peloponnesian war and what led up to it. And surely if any one were asked 'When did Athens and Sparta contend for the hegemony?', 'In the Peloponnesian war' would be the first and most obvious answer. As for the immediate context, the passage already cited in the original, it neither proves this particular reference, nor excludes it:

And the people therefore, who were in the habit of hearing this poetry, were so disposed to bravery, that they disputed the primacy with Athens, a dispute for which, it must be admitted, there was reason on both sides in high actions formerly achieved. Our ancestors had defeated that first invading army landed by the Persians upon Attica, and thus revealed the superiority of courage above wealth and of valour above numbers. The Lacedaemonians in the lines of Thermopylae, if not so fortunate, in courage surpassed all rivalry...

Mr. Macan would take the words οἱ μὲν γὰρ πρόγονοι τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐνίκησαν κ.τ.λ. as referring back to περὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίας ἀμφισβητεῖν, translating them (I presume,

and it is a perfectly legitimate translation) 'Our ancestors *defeated*' etc. He thus deduces that the 'dispute for the primacy', or, to speak with more technical accuracy, for the 'hegemony' of Hellas, consisted in the rival exploits of Athens at Marathon and Sparta at Thermopylae. Whether the term 'contest for the hegemony' applies to those battles quite as naturally as to the Peloponnesian war may be open to question; I am not sure whether *a priori* one would naturally say that the Spartans at Thermopylae were 'contending against Athens for the hegemony.' Also it does not appear, what precisely, on this reading, were the supreme exploits which, before the 'contest for the hegemony', that is *ex hypothesi* before Marathon and Thermopylae, 'had been achieved' (ἦν κατεργασμένα) by the rivals respectively, or why these previous exploits are brought into view. However I am quite ready to admit the interpretation, so far, as possible. But necessary it is not. If, upon other grounds, we see reason to think that by the 'contest for the hegemony' the speaker means the Peloponnesian war, then we shall of course refer the words οἱ μὲν γὰρ πρόγονοι κ.τ.λ., with at least equal justification, not to the more remote ἀμφισβητεῖν, but to the clause which immediately precedes them, τὰ γὰρ κάλλιστα...κατεργασμένα, translating, as in the version above, 'Our ancestors *had defeated*...', not 'Our ancestors *defeated*...', the aorist ἐνίκησαν admitting either version equally, and being in fact the only tense which, on either hypothesis, could naturally and idiomatically be employed. Marathon and Thermopylae, on this reading, were not the 'contest for the hegemony', but previous exploits which justified both rivals, the Lacedaemonians no less than the Athenians, in claiming the first place, and in pressing their claims to the arbitration of war. The orator, who throughout speaks of the Lacedaemonians with a friendly feeling, after glancing at the great duel of Athens and Sparta and at the passions of a time passed away, returns, by a dexterous transition, to the more congenial topic of their achievements against the common enemy.

From this then, and if we took this part of Lycurgus' remarks by itself, we could learn, as to his opinion respecting the date of Tyrtaeus, not indeed nothing, but nothing precise. It would appear that at all events he did not agree with the opinion established in later times, and did not put Tyrtaeus anywhere near 680 B.C. The sixth century, and the latter part of it rather, would be the

earliest epoch naturally admissible; but anywhere from 550 to 450 would be a date which, so far, we might accept.

But I did not see before, and do not see now, why we should be at the pains to consider what would be the effect of this particular portion taken separately, when the point, which (as we will assume) it would leave in doubt, has been already determined by what precedes. Lycurgus, after reminding his hearers that their fathers had established Homer as the legalized poet of Athens, and referring in this connexion particularly to the recitations at the quadrennial Panathenaea, deduces, from the educational effect of Homer upon such habitual hearers, the public spirit and Hellenic patriotism displayed by Athens in the repulse of Persia, and specially the battle of Marathon. He then continues thus:

τοιγαροῦν οὕτως ἦσαν ἄνδρες σπονδαῖοι καὶ κοινῇ καὶ ἰδέα οἱ τότε τὴν πόλιν οἰκοῦντες, ὥστε τοῖς ἀνδρειωτάτοις Λακεδαιμόνιοις ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις πολεμοῦσι πρὸς Μεσσηνίους ἀνέλκεν ὁ θεὸς παρ' ἡμῶν ἡγέμονα λαβεῖν καὶ νικήσειν τοὺς ἐναντίους.....<sup>1</sup> τίς γὰρ οὐκ οἶδε τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὅτι Τυρταῖον στρατηγὸν ἔλαβον παρὰ τῆς πόλεως, μεθ' οὗ καὶ τῶν πολεμίων ἐκράτησαν καὶ τὴν περὶ τοὺς νέους ἐπιμέλειαν συνετάξαντο, οὐ μόνον εἰς τὸν παρόντα κίνδυνον ἀλλ' εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν αἰῶνα βουλευσάμενοι καλῶς; κατέλιπε γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐλεγεία ποιήσας, ὧν ἀκούοντες παιδεύονται πρὸς ἀνδρείαν, καὶ περὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ποιήσας οὐδὲνα λόγον ἔχοντες περὶ τούτου οὕτω σφόδρα ἐσπονδάκασι ὥστε νόμον ἔθεντο κ.τ.λ.

and so we go on to a long citation from Tyrtaeus himself, and finally to the effect of this influence and training upon the Lacedaemonians, as set forth in the passage previously cited.

And therefore so excellent, both as a body and as individuals, were the men by whom our city was in those days administered, that when the Lacedaemonians, who in earlier times were first in martial qualities, had a war with the Messenians, they were commanded by the oracle to take a leader from among us, and were promised victory, if they did so, over

<sup>1</sup> The words omitted merely dwell on the splendour of the compliment thus paid to Athens, and have no bearing on the question of date. It is unnecessary to repeat here what was said in the previous paper upon the ambiguity of ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις. Mr. Macan, I am glad to see, agrees with me that these words determine nothing, and that, of the many admissible ways of construing and interpreting them, more than one is consistent with my general view.



their opponents. . . . It is matter of common knowledge that the director, whom they received from Athens, was Tyrtaeus, by whose help they overcame their enemies, and also framed a system of discipline for their youth. . . .

This is the passage of which I said, and must still say, that the only date which it allows for Tyrtaeus (in the opinion of Lyeurgus, of course) is the Messenian war of 464-454 B.C. The Athenians, from among whom Tyrtaeus emigrated, were the Athenians of those days, οἱ τότε τὴν πόλιν οἰκοῦντες. The speaker has just dwelt at length upon the great achievements of the Athenians in the Persian wars. Unless the adoption of Tyrtaeus by the Lacedaemonians took place at the same time or some closely approximate time, what can it have to do with the subject, or how could it prove the excellence attained by the Athenians in those days? And if we take the speaker to be proceeding in a proper order, if we do not arbitrarily assume that he here suddenly reverses the natural course of thought, we must suppose that he places Tyrtaeus near and after the Persian wars, not near and before them. I will even make bold to say that, if we had only Lyeurgus to deal with, no other idea would ever have been suggested. Nor will it make any difference if, forcing his arrangement, we extend those days backward so as to cover the time near, but prior to, the Persian wars. For in any case, and on pain of destroying his whole argument, they must be posterior to the legal establishment of Homer as the state-poetry and educational literature of Athens. To trace the sequel and effect of that educational advance, the most momentous thing, taken with its consequences, in all Greek history and perhaps in the history of the world, is the speaker's whole design. That the change took place, not in a day of course, but gradually, during the central part of the sixth century, all, I believe, are agreed; our authorities assign it sometimes to Pisistratus, sometimes to his sons, sometimes (but this under suspicion of prejudice) to Solon. But we should know of it, and could date it, without any express authority. We should know it by its effects. The tragedy of Aeschylus, and all the public literature which followed it, the ecclesia of Cleisthenes, and all that made its fate so different from that of other democratic experiments, the larger thoughts and wider sympathies which within a score of years converted (as Lyeurgus indicates) a mere canton into the conscious centre of a nation, and made in fact a new Hellas—the whole story of Athens

is but one commentary on the fact that towards the close of the sixth century there arose in Athens a generation of men far exceeding all predecessors and contemporaries in respect of diffused intelligence. Lyeurgus, when he deduces the repulse of the barbarian from 'the recitations at the Panathenaea', is referring in the accustomed form to this unparalleled development and its educational causes. That he should bring into his story, as part of the effect, something which happened before the new education could have produced any fruits, or before it was even begun, I took and take to be impossible. On no narrow or technical construction therefore, but on the plain purport of the whole passage, I assume 530 (or, if any one pleases, 540) to be the very earliest date to which any part of the story (Tyrtaeus included) can be carried back. But if so, we need not ask whether the speaker does or does not give us other reason for placing Tyrtaeus after the Persian wars; it is enough for the purpose that he places him after Pisistratus. For starting thence we must still come down to 464 to find any time to which the story could be fitted, to find a 'Messenian war'. At least so I supposed. If this is not so, if some hitherto unknown 'Messenian war' can be fixed (say) about 520, I shall be ready to admit that Lyeurgus might have linked Tyrtaeus with that war and date; though I should still think that, in that case, his arrangement of his matter would be perverse, and should still therefore prefer the date 464, as not raising needless objections. As things are, 464 seems not only obvious, but inevitable; it also satisfies all the other conditions of the context, following near after the Persian wars (as it should) and preceding (as it should) by about one generation that unique and special 'contest for the hegemony between Athens and Sparta' which is commonly called the Peloponnesian war.

Thus much as to the opinion of Lyeurgus. Whether he was right is another matter; I see no reason to doubt it, but will refer to my previous paper. As however I do not wish to return to the subject again, I should like to add one consideration which was before not very clearly brought out. The mere fact, that Lyeurgus attributes to Tyrtaeus the composition of commonplace, flowing, and classical elegiacs, would be of itself a grave reason for thinking that he cannot have dated Tyrtaeus as he was dated by Strabo, Pausanias, and others of those later times. I mean that the wild error as to the date of the style, though possible

in the days of Augustus or Caracalla, and quite of a piece with much that was then calmly narrated and believed, cannot with equal propriety be attributed to an Athenian statesman of the fourth century B.C. Whether Strabo or Lycurgus would have judged better in a case where knowledge was equal, we need not inquire; in this case knowledge, vital and efficient knowledge, could not be equal, and the advantage was greatly with Lycurgus. What makes the account of Strabo impossible (given for Tyrtaeus the date which he asserts) is the deep and wide difference in language, linguistic affinity, taste, habit, and tradition, which existed between Athens and Sparta until long after the era assigned, and which at that era, so far as we can conjecture, had not even begun to be bridged. Now to educated men in the age of Augustus, or even in the age of the Diadochi, distinctions of this kind, between Greek and Greek, had almost no practical importance, and were known only as matters of history, erudition, or literary fancy. The process of amalgamation, the process of which the introduction of Tyrtaeus and his works to Sparta was one, not unimportant, stage, had been accomplished, and all dialectical or local peculiarities merged, so far as concerned the ordinary life of educated men, in one common language, which flattered itself that it was Athenian. Compared with the actual state of the world, the fifth century was almost as remote and unreal as the seventh; and

there was nothing to prevent a confusion between the two but the weak barrier of acquired science. Altogether different was the position of an Athenian statesman in the fourth century, of such a man as Lycurgus. To him the moral and mental difference between Attica and Lacedaemonia was not a matter of historical or literary learning; it was a fact of vital importance in common life and current politics. The process of assimilation between the peoples, and the creation of a common medium, had by no means yet been brought so far as to put out of sight the time when it had been begun and the stages by which it had been carried on. In the very passage before us Lycurgus, as we have seen, shows himself perfectly aware that even then, in his own day, Lacedaemonia, as a whole, was a field practically closed against that literature which was being studied, admired, and enlarged by Athens. Of all that made the story of Tyrtaeus and his elegiacs, as Lycurgus tells it, possible for the middle of the fifth century, but impossible for the beginning of the seventh, Lycurgus could not, as it would seem, be ignorant. For this reason, as well as others, I take him to mean the simple, natural, and reasonable thing, which he appears to say. And since his account is contradicted by no one, who, on such a point, is entitled comparatively or positively to consideration, I accept it, as at present advised, without hesitation as true.

A. W. VERRALL.

#### THE GENITIVES Τλαστιάφο AND Πασιδάφο.

A COMPANION piece to the much-discussed Τλαστιάφο of the Menecrates monument at Corfu (Roberts, *Introd. to Grk. Epigraphy*, no. 98, Cauer, *Delectus*,<sup>2</sup> no. 83) has recently turned up in an inscription from Gela published in the *Notizie degli Scavi* of April-June '96. Written βουστροφιδόν in archaic characters as shown by the facsimile, the editor, Salinas, is fully justified in claiming it as the oldest Greek inscription of Sicily. It reads with the proper transcription: Πασιδάφο τὸ σῆμα Κράτης ἐποίησε. In a note which the editor adds to his own comments, Comparetti remarks on the genitive form with *F* as paralleled only by the Coreyran Τλαστιάφο and that in a metrical inscription, adding further that the uncon-

tracted form in -*āo* on a prose inscription of Sicily is itself a sign of considerable antiquity.

This new form after the not uncommon habit of new facts seems at first only to add to our embarrassment. For, unless I am mistaken, it completely upsets the explanation of Τλαστιάφο which up to this time has seemed the most acceptable. I refer to the view of Blass, *Sat. phil. Sauppio obl.* p. 131, approved by G. Meyer, *Grk. Gr.*<sup>2</sup> p. 335, Brugmann, *Grk. Gr.*<sup>2</sup> p. 120 and others. Blass supposes that the writer of the Menecrates epitaph, in using the epic -*āo* in place of the contracted genitive in -*ā* familiar to his own speech, was led by *vāfōs*, *lāfōs*, etc. to the spelling -*āfo*. For a single occur-

ence and that too in a metrical inscription this was plausible enough, but when we meet with a second occurrence and this time in a prose inscription, we are forced to the conviction that there is something more behind it. And yet our knowledge of the history of the genitive formation is sufficient to make it impossible to attribute any etymological value to the  $\sigma$ , Fick, BzB. 11,248, notwithstanding. There is only one form of explanation left, namely that the  $\sigma$  is due to a secondary development. One recalls the Delian  $\delta\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  and in looking up the other instances of such sporadic spelling one notes that besides the Cretan  $\delta\mu\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  and  $\delta\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  (Comparetti, *Monumenti Antichi*, iii., nos. 12-13, 18), Attic  $\delta\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ ,  $\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  (C.I.A. iv. pt. 1, pp. 189, 198), an  $\delta\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  is found on another Coreyran tombstone (Roberts, no. 99) of the same age as that containing  $\tau\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ . In these cases the  $\sigma$  is only the expression of that slight glide sound which is naturally produced in passing from another vowel sound to that of  $u$ . Anyone may make the experiment and observe it clearly in the case of  $\bar{a}u$  when pronounced slowly. But one is hardly conscious of such a glide and hence it is only rarely that it is indicated in the writing. Now the same glide is possible before a close  $o$ . The Greek  $o$ , as we know, was relatively close in those dialects in which the lengthened  $o$  was indicated by  $ou$  not  $\omega$ , and to these belong the Rhodian and

Corinthian. It is possible, though this is not a necessary assumption, that at Coreyra and Gela the final  $o$  was especially close, so that the pronunciation of the ending was not so very different from that of the Arcadian and Cyprian, which was always written  $-av$ . An Arcadian genitive in  $-av$  would give us no trouble, in view of spellings like  $\delta\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ , and my contention is that the  $\sigma$  of  $\tau\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  and  $\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$  is to be regarded in the same light.

Aside from the genitive form, the interest of the inscription is solely palaeographical, it being the second important addition to the material for the study of the alphabet of Rhodes and its colonies which has appeared since the discussions of Kirchhoff and Roberts. It shows neither the Argive type (Kirchhoff p. 48, Roberts, no. 131) which has  $\sigma$ , not sigma, nor that represented by vases of Cameirus and now by the earliest stone inscriptions of Rhodes (*Mith.* 16, 107 f.) which besides the  $\Psi=\chi$  has  $H=\eta$ . But, though most of the characteristic letters are wanting, nothing stands in the way of identifying its alphabet with that of the bronze plate found at Olympia and bearing the name of Gela (Roberts, p. 322). The two agree against the others in the combination of the three-barred sigma with  $E=\eta$ .

CARL D. BUCK.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,  
January '97.

#### THE EARLIEST APPEARANCE IN PRINT OF THE FIRST IDYLL OF MOSCHUS.

THE rare volume printed by Goltz at Bruges in 1565 under the editorship of Adolph Mekerech holds the rank of the *Editio Princeps* of Moschus and Bion. But, as is well-known, the three principal and longest Idylls of Moschus together with several of those of Bion are to be found mixed up with those of Theocritus in the volume printed by Aldus in 1495-6 which purports to contain the Eclogues of Theocritus, the verses of the Gnostic Poets, those of Hesiod and some others. This book has hitherto been supposed to be the earliest printed volume which contains any of the Idylls or fragments of Moschus, and it has escaped the notice as well of the editors of this poet as of all bibliographers that his first Idyll *Ἔπος δαρτερῆς* had been printed

six years earlier, and is in fact one of the earliest printed pieces of classical Greek, since at the date of its appearance thirteen Greek books only had issued from the press, and of these there are only three that can be considered as classics — Homer, Aesop, and the *Batrachomyomachia* — the other ten being Psalters, Grammars and Dictionaries.

Although a few words were printed with Greek letters as early as 1465 in the *Paradoxa* of Cicero given by Fust and Schoeffer in that year, and though in the works that issued from the press of Sweynheym and Pannartz from 1465 to 1470, and notably in the Aulus Gellius of 1469, as well as in one or two books of others printers, there are long passages in Greek characters, the

earliest volume printed in Greek was the first book of the *Grammar of Lascaris* which appeared at Milan in 1476 or 1477 (the colophon being dated MCCCCLXXVI die XXX Januarii). A second edition with a Latin translation by Craston was printed, also at Milan, in 1480, and a third with the same translation by Leonardus de Basilea at Vicenza in 1489. In this third edition the *Grammar* ends on the recto of the ninety-seventh leaf, and is followed on the same page by the colophon. Then on the two next pages come twenty-nine Greek verses, being in fact the first Idyll of Moschus without either the name of the author or the usual title *Ἔπος δαπτέρης* but with the rather mysterious heading *στίχη ἡρωικοὶ εἰς τὸν ἔρωτα*. The only writer so far as I know who has mentioned these verses is Dibdin who in the third volume of the *Bibliotheca Spenceriana*, p. 82, thus refers to them:—

‘On the reverse of this leaf we read nearly one half of twenty-nine verses (printed widely apart in a large full Greek type, not very dissimilar to that of the first Isocrates) which are thus whimsically entitled:—

*στίχη ἡρωικοὶ εἰς τὸν ἔρωτα*

The remaining number of these verses is on the recto of the following and last leaf which completes the tenth leaf of signature m.’ But Dibdin did not recognise these verses as those of Moschus, and indeed probably did not read them. The volume, like most early Greek impressions is carelessly printed and full of mistakes, and the

‘whimsical title’ is probably a misprint for

*στίχοι ἡρωικοὶ εἰς τὸν ἔρωτα.*

The Idyll was certainly printed from a different manuscript from that from which the copy in the Aldine Theocritus was taken, and presents numerous variations from that text, most of them perhaps errors of the copyist or of the printer but some few deserving the attention of the editors and students of Moschus. The *variae lectiones* are as follows:—

	<i>The Lascaris</i>		<i>The Aldine Theocritus</i>
Line 1	ἔβουστει	for	ἔβωστρει.
3	μηνυτὰς	„	μανυτὰς.
4	δ before ἀγάγης		is omitted.
6	ἔστι δὲ παῖς	for	ἔστι δ' ὁ παῖς.
10	δὲ χολᾶ	„	δὲ χολᾶ.
	ἡπεροπευτὰς	„	ἡπεροπευτάς.
13	τίνω	„	τήνω.
16	ἐφίπταται	„	ἐφίπταται.
17	σπλάγχχνους	„	σπλάγχχνους.
18	τόξω	„	τόξω.
19	βέλεμνον	„	βόλεμνον.
21	κῆμε πτόρσκει	„	κάμε τιτρώσκει.
22	ἀντῶ	„	αντῶ.
23	ἀνάσθει	„	αἰάθει.
24	δαμάσας	„	δάσας.
25	χλέοντα	„	κλαίοντα.
	φυλάξω	„	φυλάσσω.
26	γελᾶ	„	γελᾶ.
	φιλήσαι	„	φιλάσαι.
28	ἦν λέγη	„	ἦν δὲ λέγη.
	ὅσα μοι	„	ὅσα μοι.

RICHARD C. CHRISTIE.

### JEBB'S SOPHOCLES.

DEALING with a text so difficult as that of Sophocles, one may without disrespect occasionally differ from the interpretation of the most distinguished teacher. The appearance of the seventh and last play of the Sophoclean drama, which Professor Jebb has been giving to the world with a revised text and an English version, seems to be a fitting opportunity of offering for consideration the grounds on which in a few passages I would venture to differ from the judgment of so trustworthy a guide.

In the following remarks the texts under examination are followed by Professor Jebb's version between inverted commas.

#### *Oedipus Tyrannus.*

1. ὥς τοῖσιν ἐμπείρουσι καὶ τὰς ξυμφορὰς  
ζώσας ὀρῶ μάλιστα τῶν βουλευμάτων.  
44-45.

‘For I see that when men have been proved in deeds past, the issues of their counsels, too, most often have effect.’

A note remarks that *ἐμπείρουσι* and *βουλευμάτων* imply the antithesis between past and future.

But the position of the words shows that the antithesis lies between *ἐμπείρουσι* and *ξυμφορὰς*, and prohibits our placing any



accentuation on the distant *βουλευμάτων*. The question then is, what is the exact meaning of *ξυμφοράς*, and the answer is supplied by a line of Aeschylus:—

πιστοῖσι πιστὰ ξυμφέρειν βουλευμάτα,  
Persae 528.

which shows that it means consultation, or conference of counsel.

The lamented Professor Munro once said to me in conversation that he doubted whether so common a word as *ξυμφορά* could have borne so archaic—so etymological a meaning as conference in the days of Sophocles.

But the Persae of Aeschylus, slightly as we may esteem it, was so flattering to the pride of Athens that probably it was pretty well known by heart in the time of his rival, and would at once have suggested the meaning of *ξυμφοραὶ βουλευμάτων*.

The passage, then means: the wise (those who are good at initiative) are also best in conference of counsel (in appreciating the suggestions of another). The context, I may add, clamours for this meaning.

The love of Sophocles for *γνώμαι* is known to all his readers, and there is an obvious allusion here to the maxim of Hesiod:

οἷτος μὲν πανάριστος ὃς αὐτὸς πάντα νοήσῃ  
φρασσάμενος τὰ κ' ἔπειτα καὶ ἐς τέλος ἦσιν  
ἀμείνω.  
ἰσθλὸς δ' αὖτ' ἀκακίως ὃς εὖ εἰπόντι πίθηται.

Aristotle, as students of his Ethics know, traces the same antithesis between the *φρόνιμος* and the *συνετός*.

Professor Jebb says that *ζώσας* does not mean successful but effectual. But surely in this context these words would be synonymous.

Professor Campbell lays stress on *ξυμφοράς*, but gives it a meaning which seems to make the sentence inane. He explains: 'not only are the counsels good, but their issues are also good.' But how can counsels be good if their issues are not good?

Professor Kennedy advocated the interpretation here adopted, but I think that his pamphlet, which is not before me, contained some unconvincing view about the force of *ζώσας*.

Sophocles does not exactly reproduce Hesiod's maxim, which only asserts the superiority of Initiative to Appreciation; whereas the speaker in the text affirms that the inferior faculty accompanies the superior. And perhaps there is a further difference.

NO. XCVI. VOL. XI.

If *ἐμπειρία* only means Experience without any suggestion of Invention or Origination, the proposition of the high-priest of Zeus becomes: Experience (dealing with things) is the best preparation for Conference (dealing with persons); an antithesis which still requires Conference for its second term.

2. τοῦτον κελύω πάντα σημαίνει ἐμοί·  
κεῖ μὲν φοβέεται, τοῦτ' ἰκλήμ' ἐπεξελείν  
αὐτὸν καθ' αὐτοῦ. 226.

'And if he is afraid, I bid him to remove the danger of the charge from his own path.'

I only quote this admirable correction of the text for the sake of adding from the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* another illustration of the meaning of *ἐπεξελείν*: ἀπέκτεινον . . . ὑπεξαιρούμενοι τὸν φόβον. 35. 'Removing the objects of their fear—those in whom they saw a future danger:' where *ὑπό* does not mean, as Sandys translates, 'cunningly' but 'beforehand'—'by way of precaution,' or 'anticipation.'

3. στυγνὸς μὲν εἶκων δῆλος εἶ, βαρὺς δ' ὅταν  
θυμοῦ περάσῃς. 673.

'Sullen in yielding art thou seen, even as vehement in the excess of thy wrath.' A note adds: 'fierce when thou hast gone far in wrath.'

But surely it is a truism to say that a man is fierce when he is far gone in wrath. The position of the speakers and the tense of *περάσῃς* seem to point to the meaning: 'bitter when thou hast passed from passion,' i.e. when thou hast controlled thy fury and professed to acquit or pardon. *στυγνὸς* and *βαρὺς* seem about synonymous, and, as *ὅταν θυμοῦ περάσῃς* is equivalent to *ὅταν εἰζῇς*, the chief, or only, antithesis is between the tenses of *εἶκων* and *περάσῃς*.

4. δόκησις ἀγνὸς λόγων ᾗλθε. 681.

'Blind suspicion bred of talk arose.'

There is not much to object to here, but a note speaks of suspicions resting on assertions of Oedipus. Surely the *λόγοι* were the words of Teiresias; and the meaning is: Rashly-formed suspicions were bred of words (uttered by Teiresias); or, if *δόκησις* means interpretation rather than suspicion: Interpretation—unwarranted—of words (that fell from Teiresias, as incriminating Creon) was avowed.

If *δόκησις* means suspicion, *λόγων* will depend on *ᾗλθε*; if interpretation, on *δόκησις*.

R

5. ὄλοιθ' ὅστις ἦν ὃς ἀγρίας πέδας  
νομάδος ἐπιποδίας ἔλαβέ μ' ἀπὸ τε φόνου  
ἔρρητο. 1349.

To restore the metre (a double dochmiac) Professor Jebb would change νομάδος into μονάδ'. The line then in its resolved syllables exactly corresponds with the preceding:

ὁ κακὰ κακὰ τελῶν ἐμὰ τάδ' ἐμὰ πάθεα.

Is it worth while suggesting, what seems to me more euphonious, a change of ἐπιποδίας into ἐπιποδίου? Intervening between πέδας and ἐπιποδίου, νομάδος might surely mean: biting, wounding, lacerating; which Professor Jebb apparently doubts.

#### *Oedipus Coloneus.*

1. τοιαῦτά σοι ταῦτ' ἐστίν, ὃ ξέν', οὐ λόγοις  
τιμώμεν' ἀλλὰ τῇ ξυνουσίᾳ πλέον. 62.

'Such thou mayest know, Stranger, are these haunts, not honoured in story but rather in the life that loves them.'

The meaning of the version is not clear. Does not the text mean: 'Such, Stranger, is this spot, whose charms men attest not so much by words as by making it their abode'? Colonus was, and still is, a beautiful suburb of Athens, and probably in the days of Sophocles was the site of many villas.

2. ὦ πάντα τολμῶν κάπὸ παντὸς ἂν φέρων  
λόγον δικαίον μηχανήμα ποικίλον. 761.

'All-daring, who from any plea of right wouldest draw a crafty device,' A note adds that this is better than to make παντὸς neuter, taking λόγον δικαίον as defining genitive with μηχανήμα; which would mean: 'thou who from anything wouldest borrow a crafty device, consisting in a fair plea.' If this were the translation required, it is not surprising that the construction should be rejected. Believing the construction to be correct, I would render: 'Oh thou who from any case couldest extract a righteous defence by cunning sophistry': or, 'Oh thou who for any cause couldest construct a sanctimonious plea by cunning rhetoric:' which would not be quite so imbecile. Compare the lines which presently occur:

γλώσση σὺ δεινός· ἄνδρα δ' οὐδέιν' οἶδ' ἐγὼ  
δικαίον ὅστις ἐξ ἅπαντος εὖ λέγει. 806.

where the phrase, φέρων λόγον δικαίου μηχανήμα ποικίλον, is concentrated in a monosyllable.

3. οὐκ ἔστι σοι ταῦτ', ἀλλὰ σοι τάδ' ἐστ', ἐκεῖ  
χώρας ἀλάστωρ ὕμῳ ἐνναίων ἀεί. 787.

'That portion is not for thee, but this—my curse upon the country, ever abiding therein.'

A note rejects what seems the true construction, saying: if we joined ἐκεῖ χώρας the phrase could mean nothing but: in that part of the country, which is pointless here. The phrase would rather mean: in that part of the world, pointed, if point there must be, with something of contempt and hate in the vagueness of the expression.

The objection to joining χώρας with ἀλάστωρ is that it misplaces the emphasis, throwing it on χώρας rather than on ἀλάστωρ, and thus making the language unworthy of Oedipus and of Sophocles. 'Αλάστωρ must follow the adverb of place (ἐκεῖ χώρας) immediately and without the interposition of any enfeebling word, or the sentence is spoilt. The effect is like what would be produced on Professor Jebb's version if we were to read: upon the country my curse, instead of: my curse upon the country.

4. πρᾶγος δ' ἀτίξεν οὐδὲν ἄνθρωπον χρεών.  
1153.

'And mortal man should deem nothing beneath his care.'

A note expands this into: 'a mortal man can never be sure that an incident, seemingly trivial, will not prove momentous': a statement, be it observed, neither true nor heroic, and that should have omitted πρᾶγος.

The line, seemingly easy, is very difficult, because it requires us to specialise the meaning of a word that in general means nothing very special. The most beggarly elements of language, however, forbid us to treat so slightly, as this version does, the leading word of the proposition: but then what special meaning are we to assign to πρᾶγος? In the absence of data we are reduced to guessing. Does it mean Fortune in a generic sense, embracing prosperity and adversity, (εὐπραγία and δυσπραγία) so that we might paraphrase: No fortune is so lowly (no plight is so abject) that man, that creature of accident, should turn a deaf ear to a suppliant? The utterance of such a sentiment, besides its immediate application, might be intended to mark the idiosyncrasy of Theseus, and thus to attenuate what,

considering ancient superstitions, is the great improbability of the play; the improbability that the cry of the chorus: *ἔγω πόρσω βαίνετε χάρας*, should not have been enforced, and that Oedipus should have been permitted to remain on the soil of Athens.

τοιούτων αὐτοῖς Ἄρεος εὐβουλον πάγον  
ἐγὼ ξυνήδη χθόνιον ὄνθ', ὅς οὐκ ἐὰ  
τοιούσδ' ἀλήτας τῇδ' ὁμοῦ ναίειν πόλει.

5. ὁ δ' ἐπίκουρος ἰσοτέλεστος  
"Αἶδος ὅτε μοῖρ' ἀνυμέναιος  
ἄλυρος ἄχορος ἀναπέφηνε,  
θάνατος ἐς τελευταίαν. 1220.

'And the Deliverer makes an end for all alike,—when the doom of Hades is suddenly revealed, without marriage-song, or lyre, or dance,—even Death at the last.' Here a mistranslation, interposing a patch of words of little meaning, seems to wreck what is perhaps the most powerful lyric of Sophocles that has come down to us.

The true construction requires a comma after *ἐπίκουρος*, to show that *ἰσοτέλεστος* "Αἶδος μοῖρα is an epithet of *Γῆρας*: ἀνυμέναιος, ἄλυρος, ἄχορος being an epexegetis of *ἰσοτέλεστος* "Αἶδος. If we abide by Liddell and Scott *ἰσοτέλεστος* simply means an image or similitude. But it seems to contain the word *τέλη* in the sense of rites paid to a divine power, symbolizing the joys or blessings for which he is worshipped. We may then translate: 'and the Deliverer, when the Fate that shares the joyless rites of Hades has once appeared, rites without marriage-song, or lyre, or dance, is Death who brings the end.'

If Hades is as joyless as Age, and Thanatos introduces to Hades, how, it may be objected, can Thanatos be a deliverer from the evils of Age? The answer to this question is the key to the lyric. Hades is both joyless and painless: Age resembles Hades in the absence of joy but differs in the presence of pain. This point was the subject of the opening strophe:

ἐπεὶ πολλὰ μὲν αἱ μακρὰί  
ἡμέραι κατέθεντο δὴ  
λύπας ἐγγυτέρω, τὰ τέρ-  
ποντα δ' οὐκ ἂν ἴδοις ὅπου.

Thus Hades is a deliverance. If the true interpretation of *ἰσοτέλεστος* has been given, the word must be confined to the more auspicious aspects of the powers ruling human destinies; for, although equal in respect of

joys, that is, of their negation; in respect of sorrows or evils, it seems, Age and Hades have contrasted attributions.

For the construction of *ἰσοτέλεστος* "Αἶδος compare: *μάτρωος ἰσώνυμον ἔμμεν*, Pindar; and: *ἀδάμαντος ἰσοσθενὲς ἄορ*, Oppian.

6. ὁρᾷ ὁρᾷ ταῦτ' αἰὲ χρόνος, ἐπεὶ μὲν ἕτερα  
τὰ δὲ παρ' ἡμᾶρ αὖθις αὔξων ἄνω. 1452.

I am surprised that neither Professor Jebb nor any other editor has suggested, to satisfy the requirement of the metre (an iambus followed by two dochmiacs), what seems the obvious correction of *ὅτε* for *ἐπεὶ*. Of course *παρ' ἡμᾶρ δὲ αὖθις* would then stand for *ὅτε δέ* and *τὰ* for *ἕτερα*. The reading would involve the omission of an easily spared γάρ in the corresponding lines:

τί μὲν ἀφήσει τέλος; δέδια δ', οὐ γὰρ ἄλιον  
ἀφορμὰ ποτ' οὐδ' ἀνευ ἐνυφορᾶς.

#### *Antigone.*

1. οὐκ ἔστιν· ἀλλὰ ταῦτα καὶ πάλαι πόλεως  
ἄνδρες μόλις φέροντες ἐρρόθουν ἐμοί. 289.

'It cannot be. No! from the first there were certain in the town that muttered against me chafing at the edict.'

*πόλεως ἄνδρες* is here treated as equivalent to *τινές*: for what does 'in the town' add to the sense? But *πόλεως ἄνδρες* is the foremost idea in Creon's conception of the agency at work behind the disobedience to his decree. In monarchic or oligarchic Greece *ἡ πόλις*, that is, *ἡ ἀκρόπολις*, was occupied by the ruling caste, who alone possessed the full rights of citizenship (*πολιτεία*); and *πόλεως ἄνδρες* will accordingly mean: some persons of the highest rank—certain of the class of nobles. Creon suspects some relatives and partisans of Polynices, some members, if there was such a clan, of the clan Labdæidae.

2. "Αἶδα μόνον  
φεῦξιν οὐκ ἐπάξεται. 361.

'only against Death shall he call for aid in vain.'

The translation seems to require the reading *μόνον*. Would not *μόνον οὐ* mean: he *almost* will find a means of escaping death? Or does *μόνον οὐ* lose this force when its factors are separated by another word? One would have been glad of evidence on this point.

3. νόμους γεραίρων χθονὸς θεῶν τ' ἐνορκον δίκαν  
ὑψίπολις, ἀπολις ὅτ' τὸ μὴ καλὸν  
ξύνεστι, τόλμας χάριν. 368.

τόλμας χάριν seems to be connected with ὑψίπολις and ἀπολις rather than with ξύνεστιν; and ὑψίπολις seems more germane to the matter if taken to mean: high in the state—honoured by his country, rather than, as Professor Jebb proposes: dweller in a prosperous city.

4. ταῦτ' οὖν τέκνον φρόνησον· ἀνθρώποισι γὰρ  
τοῖς πᾶσι κοινὸν ἐστι τοῦ ξαμαρτάνειν·  
ἐπεὶ δ' ἁμάρτη κείνος οὐκ ἐστ' ἀνὴρ  
ἄβουλος οὐδ' ἀνολβος ὅστις ἐς κακὸν  
πεσὼν ἀκείται μὴδ' ἀκίνητος πέλει.  
αἰθαδία τοι σκαϊότηρ' ὀφλισκάνει. 1023.

'Self-will, we know, incurs the charge of folly.'

But this is one of the cases where arrangement supplies a word even more pointedly than if it were expressed, sometimes changing, as here, an ostensible proposition into what logicians call its simple converse. In this passage not only the order of words but the lines which precede require us to translate: 'nothing but self-will'—'only obstinacy incurs the charge of folly.' In a similar passage of the O. Col.

θανόντων δ' οὐδὲν ἄλγος ἄπτεται,

'None but the dead are insensible to pain,'  
Professor Jebb supplies the word 'only.'

5. τῷ δ' ἀθλίας ἄσσημα περιβαίνει βοῆς  
ἔρποντι μᾶλλον ἄσσον. 1209.

'And as the king drew nearer, doubtful sounds of a bitter cry floated around him.'

This translation would be admissible if the line were the composition of a modern undergraduate who would place his epithet ἀθλίας wherever it suited his metre, and perhaps would escape a scolding from his tutor: but to Sophocles no such licence was possible. The position of ἀθλίας makes it the vital point of the sentence, and, to keep it so, we *under the circumstances* must transfer the anguish from the raiser of the cry to the hearer, and render: 'an indistinct cry of dire significance (or, that froze his blood) floated round the king as he drew nearer.' The words of course intimate that Creon recognized the voice of his son.

Under other circumstances e.g. if the king expected to hear a sound, but was uncertain whether it would be joyous or mournful, our

undergraduate might by the very same words without incurring blame intend to signify that Creon heard 'a bitter cry.' This ambiguity of even well-ordered speech has its analogy in our sense-perceptions, where the same immediate sensations, according to the known circumstances which surround them, receive different interpretations and give different perceptions; e.g. may show us a gigantic bird at a distance or a fly crawling on a neighbouring window.

### Electra.

1. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἵππος εὐγενής, κἂν ἡ γέρων,  
ἐν τοῖσι δεινοῖσι θυμὸν οὐκ ἀπώλεσε. 24.

'As a steed of generous race, though old, loses not courage in danger but pricks up his ear.'

But θυμὸν ἀπολλύναι is not Greek for losing courage, in the sense of experiencing a transient emotion of fear. The old charger *has* permanently lost his youthful spirits and fire (θυμὸν) except at the approach of danger: then they revive. The true version then is: 'as a steed of generous race, though old, *recovers* youthful fire in the moment of danger.' Professor Jebb quotes a writer who, feeling instinctively the accentuation that ἐν τοῖσι δεινοῖσι receives from its position, perhaps unconsciously, when referring to these lines, substitutes in thought for οὐκ ἀπώλεσε the word ἀνακτάται. καὶ εἶδον ἄνδρα παραπλήσιον τῷ Σοφοκλείῳ ἵππῳ· ἡθρὸς γὰρ ὕψ' ἡλικίας δοκῶν, νεύζονσαν ὁρμὴν ἐν ταῖς σπουδαῖς ἀνεκτάτο. Philostratus.

2. δράσω· τὸ γὰρ δίκαιον οὐκ ἔχει λόγον  
δνοῖν ἐρίζειν, ἀλλ' ἐπισπεύδειν τὸ δρᾶν. 466.

'I will. When a duty is clear, reason forbids that two voices should contend, and claims the hastening of the deed.'

When a duty, or anything else, is clear, only a fool persists in negation: but when a duty, as in the present case, is not clear, what is to be done? Well! we may abide by a popular proverb. Translate then: 'In a question of duty it is not meet that one should dispute with two, but that he should hasten performance.' Chrysothemis is one, Electra and the Coryphaeus two. Ἐνα or μίαν is understood, δίκαιον is governed by ἐρίζειν, ἔχει λόγον is impersonal, or has for subject the sentence τὸ δίκαιον δνοῖν ἐρίζειν. τὸ δίκαιον δνοῖν ἐρίζειν has been well compared with ἐρίζειν κάλλος Ἀθήνη.

The proverbial maxims that a perso age



accepts an effective touch, a Greek critic observes, in the portraiture of character. ἡθικοὺς γὰρ ποιεῖ τοὺς λόγους τὸ γνωμολογεῖν. Arist. *Rhetoric* 2, 21.

The acceptance of the decision of the majority in a case of conscience is characteristic of the weaker-minded Chrysothemis. She was not born, like her sister Electra, to play the part of Athanasius contra mundum.

3. ἤξει καὶ πολὺπους καὶ πολύχειρ  
ἀ δεινοῖς κρυπτομένα λόγοις  
χαλκόπους Ἐρινύς. 489.

'The Erinys of untiring feet, who is lurking in her dread ambush, will come as with the march and with the might of a great host.'

This gives substantially the meaning of the Greek. But in lyrical poetry so much depends on the exact sequence of words and ideas, that a translation is hardly faithful where these are much dislocated and the perspective of the imagery altered. Something like the following will show (Professor Jebb could show us much better) how the meaning might be given, and the order of words not seriously changed: 'Come there will, both many-footed and many-handed, one now lurking in dread ambush, adamant-heeled Erinys.'

4. ἐξεκίνησεν ποδοῦν  
στικτὸν κεράστην ἔλαφον, οὐ κατὰ σφαγὰς  
ἐκκομάσας ἔπος τι τυγχάνει βαλὼν. 567.

'He shot it, and chanced to utter a certain boast concerning its slaughter.'

'Concerning its slaughter' seems needlessly prosaic; and, after saying that Agamemnon killed the stag, it was unnecessary to add that he hit it. βαλὼν, then, must govern ἔπος, not αὐτὸν understood. Translate: and at its death, as he vaunted his exploit, an irreverent word chanced to escape his lips.'

5. ἔπειτα λύων ἥνιαν ἀριστεράν  
κάμπτοντος ἵππου λανθάνει στήλην ἄκραν  
παίσας. 743.

A note says that, when the car had to turn round the goal from right to left, Orestes slackened the left rein a moment too soon, and that this caused the collision. On the authority of a mathematical friend Professor Jebb supposes that, when the left rein was slackened, the new force applied by the horse to the left side of the chariot

would give it an angular velocity, i.e. would make it begin to rotate from left to right round its own centre, and thus would swing its hinder extremity towards the goal. Its hinder extremity, perhaps! But could rotation of the car round its own centre, which would be the longitudinal centre of the axle, bring the axle-head any nearer to the goal, and cause a crash? Indeed, the greatest chance of collision when the car was rounding the goal would be when the axle was in its normal position, i.e. when it was at right angles to the tangent of the goal, supposing the goal to be cylindrical. Any deflection from this position caused by an angular velocity would increase the distance of the axle-head from the goal, and instead of increasing, diminish the chance of contact. This explanation then of the catastrophe is inadmissible.

The proposal of other editors to substitute *τείνων* or *ἀνέλκων*, or some other equivalent, for *λύων* is more intelligible. This however is unnecessary if we notice the tenses of *λύων* and *παίσας*. 'Present tense,' as everyone knows, is only an appropriate name of a form in the indicative mood: in the participle the corresponding form would be more correctly termed the imperfect. *Λύων* accordingly means 'beginning to loosen,' 'proceeding to loosen,' 'setting about loosening.' Instead of slackening the rein a moment too soon, Orestes slackened it, or was going to slacken it, a moment too late; and the collision had occurred before the slackening was an accomplished fact; at least before the horse could take advantage of it. Orestes had pulled the chariot on to the goal. *Λύων*, in other words, is nearly equivalent to *λύσας*: if Sophocles had written *λύσας*, an angular velocity might have occurred, (as to that I bow to the mathematicians) and, whether it occurred or no, the disaster would have been inexplicable.

6. φέροντες αὐτοῦ σμικρὰ λείψαν' ἐν βραχεῖ  
τεύχει θανόντος, ὡς ὀρᾷς, κομίζομεν. 1113.

'He is dead; and in a small urn, as thou seest, we bring the scanty relics home.'

This translation gives no force to *φέροντες* which from its position in the forefront of the statement should be its principal feature. To give the word its due weight we must render somewhat as follows: 'On our shoulders we are bringing his poor relics—all that death has left of him—in the narrow vessel which thou seest, to the place of his birth.' *Φέροντες*, governing no case, is here equivalent to an adverb (*φοράδην*), and per-

haps would suggest *ἐκφορά* (a funeral procession).

7. ἀνέφελον ἐνέβαλες  
οὔποτε καταλύσιμον  
οὐδέποτε λησόμενον  
ἀμέτερον οἷον ἔφν κακόν. 1246.

'Thou hast reminded me of my sorrow, one which from its nature cannot be veiled, cannot be done away with, cannot forget.'

To show the difference in the construction of *ἀνέφελον* and the other epithets we should rather render:

'In cloudless daylight thou revealest how unforgiving, how unforgetting, is the nature of our sorrow': or, taking with Professor Jebb *οἷον ἔφν* as a separate sentence:

'Into blaze of day thou flingest the wrongs we have endured, that, by their nature, can never be atoned, and never can forget.'

#### Ajax.

1. ἐγὼ σφ' ἀπείργω, δυσφόρους ἐπ' ὀμμασι  
γνώμας βαλοῦσα τῆς ἀνηκέστου χαρᾶς. 51.

'I, even I, withheld him, for I cast upon his eyes the tyrannous fancies of his baneful joy.'

It will be seen that, by the removal of a comma after *βαλοῦσα*, the genitive *χαρᾶς* is made to be governed by *γνώμας* instead of *ἀπείργω*. Ought not in such a case both or neither of the words to have an article? But, if the construction is possible, is it not a wanton injury to the style? Would any trick of elocution on the part of the actor make an Athenian audience suppose that such a construction was intended?

2. φίλων γὰρ οἱ τοιοῦδε νικῶνται λόγοις. 330.

'Men in his case can be won by the words of friends.'

This may seem a fair translation of the Greek, and gives a sense which does not jar with the situation, and yet it is hardly what Tecmessa means. 'Can be won' is the gist of the English proposition; whereas *νικῶνται* by its position in the Greek is absolutely devoid of accentuation. As the play proceeds we shall see the way in which Ajax responded to the pleadings of a woman:

οὐκ ἐκτός; οὐκ ἄψορρον ἐκνεμὲ πόδα;  
ἄγαν γε λυπεῖς.  
τοῖς ἀκούουσιν λέγε.  
πόλλ' ἄγαν ἤδη θροεῖς.  
μῶρά μοι δοκεῖς φρονεῖν. &c., &c.

The word *ἀνδρῶν* is not used by Tecmessa, who prefers the more honorific *φίλων*, but she means:

ἀνδρῶν γὰρ οἱ τοιοῦδε νικῶνται λόγοις.

'Only male friends can influence natures like his.' In the Greek camp *ἀνδρῶν* would usually be a part of the connotation of *φίλων*; and the emphasis on the word implies that Tecmessa excludes herself, and probably her sex, from the orbit of its meaning. The Chorus afterwards remember her hint and say:

παῖδαί γε μέντοι, καὶ δὸς ἀνδράσιν φίλοις  
γνώμης κρατῆσαι, τάσδε φροντίδας μεθεῖς.

3. τί γὰρ παρ' ἡμᾶρ ἡμέρα τέρπειν ἔχει  
προσθεῖσα κἀναθεῖσα τοῦ γε καθανεῖν;  
475.

'What joy is there in day following day—now pushing us forward, now drawing us back, on the verge—of death?'

τοῦ καθανεῖν is taken to be governed by *ἀναθεῖσα*, while a dative understood is governed by *προσθεῖσα*. A note paraphrases: 'what power to please him has each successive day when it has brought him close up to death, and then again moved him back from death.'

I do not understand what is meant by this alternate approach and recession of death. Is it not better to make τοῦ γε καθανεῖν a genitive after *ἡμᾶρ* and *ἡμέρα*, and translate: 'what advantage has one day over another day, one accelerating, the other retarding, but both ushering in the same conclusion—death'? Παρὰ then will not suggest succession but comparison, as usual.

4. κρείσσων γὰρ Αἰδᾶ κεύθων ὁ νοσῶν μάταν.  
635.

Although Professor Jebb has amply illustrated the use of the participle with *κρείσσων* instead of the infinitive with *κρείσσειν*; to show how deeply rooted this idiom was in the language I add an instance from Pindar: *ἀνεν θεοῦ δὲ σεσιγαμένον οὐ σκαϊώτερον χρῆμ' ἕκαστον*. Olymp. 9, 156. i.e. 'Every ill-starred enterprise were better (were not more inglorious) buried in silence.'

5. ἄρ' ὑμῖν οὗτος ταῦτ' ἔδρασεν ἐνδίκᾳ; 1282.

'Would ye allow that he did his duty there?'

But Teucer does not admit that Ajax owed any duty to the Atridae. His contention is that the exploits of Ajax were works of supererogation; and we may render; 'Were these deeds of this hero dues he owed to you?' *i.e.* 'Were these exploits a bounden service that you his lords could claim and owe him no thanks?' There is a contemptuous emphasis on *ἐμῶν*.

Such are certain scruples that have occurred to my mind in reperusing a favourite author under Professor Jebb's guidance. To note all the solutions of difficulties, happy emendations of the text, and instructive discussions that are to be met with in these volumes would be an incomparably longer task.

E. POSTE.

#### NOTES ON OEDIPUS TYRANNUS.

##### L. 227.

κεί μὲν φοβεῖται, τοῦτί κλημ' ὑπέξελεῖν  
αὐτὸν καθ' αὐτοῦ.

In support of Professor Jebb's translation of *ὑπέξελεῖν*, 'to remove the danger...from his path,' may be cited the following passage from the *Att. Pol.* ch. 35 § 4. ἀλλ' ἀπέκτεινον τοὺς καὶ ταῖς οὐσίαις καὶ τῷ γένει καὶ τοῖς ἀξιώμασιν προέχοντας, ὑπεξαίρουμένοι τε τὸν φόβον καὶ βουλόμενοι τὰς οὐσίας διαρπάζειν.

##### L. 324.

ὁρῶ γὰρ οὐδὲ σοὶ τὸ σὸν φώνημ' ἴδν  
πρὸς καιρόν· ὡς οὖν μηδ' ἐγὼ ταῦτ' ὅν πάθω—

Professor Jebb writes thus: '(I do not speak), for I see..., and below, '(I do not speak), then, in order that *neither* (μηδέ) may I share your mishap (of speaking amiss).' Professor Campbell says, 'it is needless to suppose an aposiopesis.' In the first place, the words 'I do not speak' are to be supplied only at the *beginning* of the couplet; 'I withhold the response because (γάρ) etc.' In the second place, there is, I think, an aposiopesis, this being one of the passages where the sense is completed by the action on the stage. There is, therefore, a word to be supplied at the end of the couplet by the reader, *viz.* *ἄπειμ*, which is supplied to the spectator by the action of Teiresias, who turns as though to leave the stage, thus evoking from Oedipus the remonstrance, *μὴ πρὸς θεῶν...ἀποστραφῆς*. On the same passage Professor Jebb comments: 'φρονῶν γ', if thou hast understanding (of this matter); cp. 569.....But in 328 οὐ φρονεῖτε = "are without understanding," "are senseless." Surely this weakens the point. 'Turn not away,' cries Oedipus, 'if you know the truth, we all entreat you.' 'Yes,' replies the prophet, 'you all entreat, because *you* do not know the truth.' That is to say, the sense of *φρονεῖν* in both places is exactly the same.

##### L. 501.

σοφία δ' ἂν σοφίαν | παραμείψειεν ἀνὴρ.

'I admit that one man may excel another in the art of interpreting omens according to the general rules of augural lore' (Jebb, *ad loc.*). But if such an art can produce true results, then the diviner does win knowledge above that of the chorus, which they have just asserted is not the case; if it cannot, it seems idle to say that one man may excel another in doing what when done has no useful result, and absurd to honour such empty superiority with the title of *σοφία*. Rather *σοφία* is 'wisdom' in its most general sense as opposed to divination altogether.

##### Ll. 715 seqq.

καὶ τὸν μὲν, ὥσπερ γ' ἡ φάτις, ξένοι ποτὲ  
λησται φονέονσ' ἐν τριπλαῖς ἀμαξίτοισ'  
παιδὸς δὲ βλάστας οὐ διέσχον ἡμέραι  
τρῆς, καὶ νῦν ἄρθρα κείνος ἐνζεύξας ποδοῖν  
ἔρριψεν ἄλλων χερσὶν εἰς ἄβατον ὄρος.

No commentator has, as far as I know, pointed out the fact that Oedipus clearly hears nothing of this speech after line 716. Were it otherwise he must have at once identified himself by the reference to the piercing of his feet, a reference he is quick to understand at l. 1032. 'The mention of "three roads" has startled Oedipus,' says Professor Jebb, but it should be put more strongly. He is stunned by the words, and rendered wholly unconscious of what follows, and this was doubtless conveyed by the gestures of the actor.

##### L. 800.

καὶ σοι, γύναι, τάληθες ἔξερω. τριπλῆς

In support of this line as against those who, with Dindorf and Nauck, would eject it, may be cited Virg. *Aen.* iv. 20, where Dido, when, like Oedipus here, approaching a confession, uses exactly similar language,

Anna, fatebor enim, miseri post fata Sychaei  
Conjugis—cet.

HERBERT W. GREENE.

OVID'S *HEROIDES*.

(Continued from p. 106).

## VII 23—26

Vror, ut inducto ceratae sulpure taedae,  
*ut pia fumosis addita tura rogis.*  
 Aeneas oculis semper uigilantis inhaeret,  
 Aenean animo noxque diesque refert.

24 and 25 are found neither in P nor in G nor in more than a few of the other MSS.

The archetype itself contained many interpolated verses, which appear accordingly in P and G and all the rest. But some of the later MSS proffer new interpolations, from which P and G and many of the others are free. I here enquire whether, in spite of this fact, any of the later MSS preserve genuine verses which have been omitted by P and G.

Some of the inserted lines betray their spuriousness plainly in language or metre, as v 26 'est in qua nostri littera scripta memor' and iv 132<sup>a</sup> sq. 'Saturnus periit, perierunt et sua regna: | sub Ioue nunc mundus; iura Iouis sequere': such as these I leave alone. Nor shall I here discuss the couplets with which many MSS have filled up real or imaginary gaps at the opening of certain epistles. But I shall examine five places in the body of the poems where later MSS offer verses which are missing from the oldest.

First viii (Hermione) 19 sqq.

sit socer exemplo nuptae repetitor  
 adeptae,  
 nupta foret Paridi mater, ut ante  
 fuit.

So P and G and most MSS. In hopes of making sense, Merkel and others have altered *sit* to *si*, but have made no sense: the meaning is imagined to be 'if your father-in-law had set about reclaiming his bride in your fashion (*exemplo* for *tu* *exemplo* !), my mother would have remained the bride of Paris': 'neque oratio constat (neque enim post *si* omitti *esset* aut *fuisse* potest) neque sententia ulla est' says Madvig. Mr Riese has another plan: '*sis* (socer exemplo *est*) nuptae repetitor adeptae: | nupta foret, Priami mater ut ante fuit?' The reader cannot construe this pentameter, so I must explain that Mr Riese intends it to signify 'ought your

bride to be what my mother formerly was to Paris?' Now turn from these editors to a critic: Madvig adu. crit. i p. 46 'Ovidius scriperat: *sit socer exemplo nuptae repetitor adeptae* (sequere exemplum soceri tui); deinde excidit pentameter et hexameter ab *si* incipiens condicionemque continens (*si*, ut tu, lente raptam coniugem tulisset), cuius apodosis est in u. 22 *nupta foret Paridi mater, ut ante fuit*.' Well, a few late MSS give:

sit socer exemplo nuptae repetitor  
 adeptae,  
*cui pia militiae causa puella fuit.*  
*si pater ignarus uacua stertisset in aula,*  
 nupta foret Paridi mater, ut ante  
 fuit...

and these verses, in one form or another, are accepted by Heinsius and the old editors in general. The lines fill the gap which Madvig detects; they fill it with the sense which he requires; and they exhibit the homoearchon (*sit* 19, *si* 21) which explains their disappearance from the other MSS. But Burmann pointed out that *stertisset* (this is clearly the original reading: some MSS have the blunder *stetisset*, and others *sedisset* or *plorasset* as attempts to correct that blunder) is a false form for *stertuisset*. It is not indeed in itself suspicious; but Persius has *destertuivit*, and it is strange that Probus and Priscian, who quote that for *stertui*, should ignore *sterti* if *stertisset* stood in Ovid's *heroides*. To be sure, you might conjecture *iacuisset* and assume that the first half of the verb was absorbed by *uacua* and then restored amiss; but it is still perhaps a trifle clumsy that *socer* in 19 should mean 'your father-in-law' and *pater* in 21 'my father'; and if with one MS you read *socer* in 21, that is worse, because *mater* in 22 ought then to mean 'your mother.' Therefore I hesitate to say that these two verses, though they make good a real defect, are genuine.

Next I take the best authenticated instance. xiii (Laodamia) 73 sqq.

pugnet et aduersos tendat Menelaus in  
 hostis:  
 hostibus e mediis nupta petenda uiro  
 est.  
 causa tua est dispar.



Laodamia says that Menelaus has a reason for risking his life but Proteus has none. Not a word is wanting, and no one could suspect an error. But almost all the MSS, except the three oldest, P, G and V (frag. Vindobonense saec. xii), present the passage thus:

pugnet et aduersos tendat Menelaus in  
hostis,  
ut rapiat Paridi quam Paris ante sibi;  
irruat et, causa quem uicit, uincat et  
armis:  
hostibus e mediis nupta petenda uiro  
est.

Heinsius thought these verses Ovid's, and in themselves they are quite Ovidian. Moreover there is no visible reason why an interpolator should insert them. But in this context they are alien and disturbing. The hexameter 75 with its irrelevant antithesis 'causa quem uicit, uincat et armis' serves merely to distract attention from Laodamia's argument. The pentameter 74 serves just the same purpose as 76, and therefore must be spurious if 76 is genuine. But it may be genuine if 76 is spurious; and surely 74 is much the better and more Ovidian pentameter of the two. I strongly suspect then that what Ovid wrote is this:

pugnet et aduersos tendat Menelaus in  
hostis,  
ut rapiat Paridi quam Paris ante sibi.  
causa tua est dispar.

And this is actually the reading of two Gotha MSS saec. xiii and xv. The variants will then be explained as follows. The true pentameter *ut rapiat...* was early lost and its place supplied by *hostibus e...*: this stage appears in P G V. Later the true pentameter was written in the margin; but then, in the copy from which most of our MSS descend, it was inserted, not instead of the false pentameter, but beside it, and an hexameter was manufactured to stand between them.

Come now to vii (Dido) 97 sqq.

exige, laese pudor, poenas, uiolate  
Sychaei,  
ad quas, me miseram, plena pudoris eo.

For *Sychaei* some MSS have *Sychaeu* or *Sychaeo* or *Sychaeae*. This distich is compact of vice: *pudoris* is impossible beside *pudor*, so Heinsius suggests *ruboris*; the style having been thus improved, what is to be

the construction and the sense? if you read '*umbraeque Sychaei*' with Merkel or '*tae daeque S.*' with Mr Birt, those are violent changes; if you read with some old editors '*uiolate Sychaeae, | ad quem*', that is a violent change and a harsh asyndeton into the bargain. Now see how a very few late MSS relieve the passage of all its faults:

exige, laese pudor, poenas, uiolataque  
lecti  
iura n/c ad cineres fuma retenta meos,  
uosque, mei manes, animaeque cinisque  
Sychaei,  
ad quas, me miseram, plena pudoris  
eo.

I do not understand how anyone can doubt that this interpolator, if interpolator he is, has hit precisely on the seat of corruption: the scribe's eye glanced from a *que* in 97 to a *que* in 99 and he wrote

exige, laese pudor, poenas, uiolataque  
Sychaei,

which was then reduced to metre by the conjecture *uiolate* in agreement with '*pudor*'. The sense too is just what Ovid must have given. *cinisque* in 99 cannot be right, and Bentley proposes *umbraeque* which might be lost after *animaeque*: for the expression compare met. viii 488 '*fraterni manes animaeque recentes*', Verg. Aen. v 80 sq. '*recepti | nequiquam cineres animaeque umbraeque-paternalae*', Sil. xiii 395 '*manis animasque suorum*'. If the lines are an interpolation, its ingenuity is amazing; but before we call them probably genuine let us take one instance more.

ii (Phyllis) 17 sqq.

saepe deos supplex, ut tu, scelerate,  
ualeres,  
ipsa mihi dixi '*si nalet ille, uenit*'.

This, as may be seen, is neither sense nor grammar. One MS, the old but very corrupt and interpolated Etonensis, saves the grammar and leaves the sense forlorn with the obvious and trumpery conjecture *diis* for *deos*; and one editor, Mr Palmer, proposes *deo* in emulation. Mr Palmer I believe is a student not only of Ovid but of Dickens; so I suppose that is the reason why he makes Phyllis talk like Mr F's Aunt. Now in the first Aldine edition (an. 1502) is given the following supplement:

saepe deos supplex, ut tu, scelerate,  
ualeres,  
sum prece turicremis deuenerata focus;  
saepe, uidens uentos caelo pelagoque  
fauentes,  
ipsa mihi dixi 'si ualet ille, uenit'.

Burmam also found the lines in two MSS: of MSS now known only one, Giessensis bibl. acad. 66 (saec. xiv), presents them, with the reading *cum prece turmonis sum uenerata sacris*. Here is a deliverance indeed. The pentameter 'ipsa mihi' cet. is now no longer a maundering irrelevancy but apt and beautiful; the homoearchon *saepe* in 17 and 19 shows at a glance how the two lines were lost; and the diction, as Mr Sedlmayer points out *prol. crit.* p. 52, is thoroughly Augustan: the rare *turicremis* occurs in Ovid himself at *ars iii* 393 'turicremas...aras', and the rarer *deueneror* in Tib. i 5 14 'somnia ter sancta deueneranda mola'. I heartily agree then with almost every editor old and new that the lines are Ovid's; and I wish the lesson taught by this passage to be remembered in dealing both with the passage last considered and with the passage from which I started and to which after this long circuit I now return, vii 23—26.

To begin with, 24 and 25 appear in the same cod. Giessensis which has preserved ii 18 and 19; but they appear also in seven other MSS of Mr Sedlmayer's, including the respectable Francofurtanus which is our chief authority for the epistula Sapphus. Necessary to the sense they are not; but that may be thought to tell in their favour, because there was nothing to prompt an interpolation. And if they are genuine there is a plain reason why they should fall out: *uror* and *ut, Aeneas* and *Aenean*. And further, it is surely much more Ovidian to give such different thoughts as the contents of 23 and 26 a distich apiece, than to crowd them in a single couplet. For all these reasons put together I think that 24 and 25 are genuine.

But still to admit them will entail one trifling change. In the distich 'Aeneas oculis semper uigilantis inhaeret, | Aenean animo noxque diesque refert' you cannot have day in both verses and night in the pentameter alone. Therefore I should emend the passage thus:

uror, ut inducto ceratae sulphure taedae,  
ut pia fumosis addita tura rogis.  
Aeneas oculis semper uigilantis in-  
haeret,  
Aenean animo noxque quiesque refert.

There is perhaps some trace of this in P, which has not *diesque* but simply *dies*: that may mean that when 24 and 25 had been lost and the mention of day became necessary in 26, someone wrote *dies* in the margin, and P substituted this not for *quies*, like the other MSS, but for *quiesque*.

## VII 73—78

Da breue saeuitiae spatium pelagique  
tuaequae:  
grande morae pretium tuta futura  
uia est.  
nec mihi tu curae: puero parcaturo Iulo. 75  
te satis est titulum. mortis habere  
meae.  
quid puer Ascanius, quid di meruere  
penates?  
ignibus ereptos obruet unda deos?

The old vulgate of 75 was the 'nec mihi tu parcas' of many MSS, which gives a fair sense, though 'tu' is superfluous and worse: Heinsius introduced from a few MSS the much more elegant 'nec mihi parcaturo'. He was acquainted with the 'nec mihi tu curae' of P and G, but of course he never dreamt of printing such nonsense. The modern editors all accept it, and evidently have no inkling that there is anything wrong. Yet what could be more preposterous? How can Dido pretend that she does not care for Aeneas? what in the world is she writing this epistle for? what does she mean by saying 22 'unde tibi, quae te sic amet, uxor erit?', 29 sq. 'non tamen Aeneas, quamvis male cogitat, odi, | sed queror infidum quastaque peius amo', 61 sq. 'perdita ne perdam, timeo, noceamus nocenti, | ne bibat aequoreas naufragus hostis aquas', 170 'dum tua sit Dido, quidlibet esse feret', 180 sqq. 'tempora parua peto, | dum freta mitescunt et amor..... | si minus, est animus nobis effundere uitam'? But I am almost ashamed to speak about a point so obvious.

Dido has been plying Aeneas with reasons against sailing: the weather is stormy; the sea is dangerous at the best of times; dangerous especially to oath-breakers; he can have a safer voyage if he will but wait. Now she goes on 'Even if you care nothing for these considerations, at least have pity on your son'.

haec minus ut cures, puero parcaturo Iulo.

hec min' ut cures for nec mihi tu cure. I have altered all four words; but the four

alterations together are only a trifle: *haec* and *nec* are much exchanged, *minus* and *mihi* at Plaut. *truc.* 900 and elsewhere, *ut* and *tu* just four lines back at 71, where Madvig restores *ut tum* for *tutum*, and many a time again. To write *nos* or *me* for *nec* is less easy: to write *nil*, which the scribes would spell *nihil*, for *mihi* is equally easy but has less of an Ovidian flow.

## VII 81—86.

Omnia mentiris; nec enim tua fallere  
lingua  
incipit a nobis primaque plector ego.  
si quaeras ubi sit formosi mater Iuli,  
occidit a duro sola relicta uiro.  
*haec mihi narraras: at me mouere!*  
merentem  
ure: minor culpa poena futura mea  
est.

85

This reading of 86 (*ure P, inde G, illa al.*) and punctuation of the couplet have been rightly adopted by Madvig and the latest editors from Burmann. In 85 the above reading is that of the MSS with no considerable variation except that E and many others have *nouere* for the *mouere* of P and G. The required sense is well stated by Madvig: 'manifestum est intellectumque ab aliis, Dido se inculcare, quod non admonita ipsius Aeneae de se narratione fraudem cauerit, poenamque non recusare'. The words are apparently supposed, by those who retain them, to signify: 'you told me this story: it melted my heart! torture me, for I deserve it: my punishment will be less than my fault'. But that 'me mouere' should mean anything of the sort is a flat impossibility. 'mouere' in itself is a word of neutral sense and means simply 'to produce an effect upon'. Here, where its subject is a tale of betrayal, its sense, if it ceases to be neutral, can only be 'to produce its effect (its natural effect) upon': that is, 'to render mistrustful'. Therefore, if *mouere* is retained, *at* must be altered, with Burmann and a few MSS, to *nec* (I would not suggest *haut*): 'you told me this story, yet it was wasted upon me',—therefore she deserves to suffer for her blindness.

Madvig on the other hand obtains equally good sense by writing '*di me monuere*' 'it was a warning from heaven'. I accept *monuere*, but I write with a slighter change

*haec mihi narraras: sat me monuere:*  
*merentem ure cet.*

'you told me this story: it gave me fair warning'. The cause of the corruption is obvious. The form *sat* already occurs once in the *heroides* at xii 75, and I shall have to introduce it once again.

## VII 191—196.

Anna soror, soror Anna, meae male  
conscia culpa,  
iam dabis in cineres ultima dona  
meos.  
nec consumpta rogis inscribar Elissa  
Sychaei;  
hoc tamen in tumuli marmore carmen  
erit:  
'praebuit Aeneas et causam mortis et  
ensem.  
ipsa sua Dido concidit usa manu.'

195

The *tamen* of 194 has either an absurd meaning or none at all. *sed* would be sense: that would mean 'my epitaph shall not link my name with Sychaeus, but, on the contrary, with Aeneas'. *tamen* means 'my epitaph shall not link my name with Sychaeus, but, in spite of that, it shall link it with Aeneas': which is ridiculous. Bentley, as you would expect, paid attention to this, and rendered *tamen* correct by changing the *nec* of 193 to *et*: that is, 'my epitaph shall link my name with Sychaeus, but, in spite of that, with Aeneas too'.

But the whole tenour of the epistle is surely in favour of *nec*; so I would rather alter *tamen* itself:

*hoc tantum* in tumuli marmore carmen  
erit.

*tantum* and *tamen* are eternally confused, and no wonder, when the abbreviation *tñ* means *tamen* in one MS and *tantum* in another. I think this *tantum* 'merely' is supported by fast. iii 547 sqq. where this epitaph of Dido is repeated word for word, with the introduction, also borrowed hence, 'tumulique in marmore carmen | hoc breue, quod moriens ipsa reliquit, erat'.

## VIII 43—50.

Ille licet patriis sine fine superbiat actis,  
et tu quae referas facta parentis  
habes.

Tantalides omnis ipsumque regebat  
Achillem:  
hic pars militiae, dux erat ille ducum.

45

tu quoque habes proauum Pelopem  
 Pelopisque parentem;  
 si medios numeres, a Ioue quintus  
 eris.  
 nec uirtute cares. arma inuidiosa tulisti,  
 sed tu quid faceres? induit illa  
 pater.

50

45. Instead of *regebat*, P has *petebat*, which I suspect to be, as it sometimes is, a corruption of *tenebat* 'commanded', possibly through *tepebat*. *regebat* may then be either a correction of *petebat*, or an explanation of *tenebat*, or a corruption of it, possibly through *tepebat*.

50. The required sense of 'tu quid faceres?' is not 'how could you help it?' but simply 'how could you help it?' so the pronoun only cumbers the ground. The required sense of 'induit illa pater' is 'your father put those arms upon you', but it cannot have the required sense: it signifies 'your father put those arms upon himself': 'induo arma' without a dative means 'induo arma mihi', not 'alteri'. Repair the defect by discarding the superfluity:

sed tibi (quid faceres?) induit illa pater.

See ars i 197 'induit arma tibi genitor patriaeque tuusque'.

## VIII 55—60.

Increpat Aeacides laudemque in crimina  
 uertit,  
 et tamen aspectus sustinet ille meos.

55

(To be continued.)

rumpor et ora mihi pariter cum mente  
 tumescunt  
 pectoraque inclusis ignibus usta  
 dolent.

Hermione coram quisquam obiecit  
 Oresti,  
 nec mihi sunt uires nec ferus ensis  
 adest?

60

59 is thus written by the first hand of P; the first hand of G omits the verse; the second hands of both, which are entirely worthless, amend the metre with *quisquamne*. But *obiecit* remains doubly vicious: it is perfect when it ought to be present; and it lacks an accusative, though no example is quoted of the absolute use of the verb. Therefore, if there were reason to think *quisquamne* the true reading, I should remove these two vices by altering *obiecit* to *obtreclat*.

But the *ne* has no authority, and other MSS give *quisquam haec* and *si quisquam* and *si quicquam* and *quicquamne*: it is quite evident that the line was metrically deficient in the archetype, as it is in P, and has been variously but unskillfully mended. To get rid of all its faults, not in metre only but in sense and grammar too, I propose  
 Hermione coram quicquam obiecit

<alter> Orestae?

*alt-er* would easily vanish between *ecit* and *or. obiicit* = *obicit*.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

## EMENDATIONS OF LUCRETIIUS.

As the corrections of Lucretius' text which I have proposed at various times are scattered over the volumes of the *Cambridge Journal of Philology* from 1871 to the present time, I have thought it worth while to present them collectively, here, with the number of the *Journal*, and the year appended, for the convenience of readers.

## I. 554, 5

Ut nil ex illis a certo tempore posset  
 Conceptum summum aetatis peruadere finis.

Read *fini* 'nothing could reach through the crowning-point of life with an end,' i.e.

pass through the stages of birth and consummation to destruction.

*J. of Philol.* xv. p. 10 (1885).

## II. 43

Ornatas armis †statuas pariterque animatas.

*Statuas* is accus. plur., not 2nd. pers. pres. subj.

*J. of Philol.* xiv. 90 (1885).

## II. 553

Disiectare solet magnum mare transtra  
 †cauerna.



Read *cauernas*, as in Cic. *de Orat.* iii. 180 Quid tam in nauigio necessarium quam latera quam cauernae, quam prora, quam puppis, quam antennae, quam uela, quam mali? and cf. Serv. on *Aen.* ii. 19 Alii fustes curuos nauium quibus extrinsecus tabulae adfiguntur cauernas appellarunt.

*J. of Philol.* xiv. 90 (1885).

## II. 1162

Conficimus ferrum uix aruis †suppeditati.

Read *suppetiati*.

*J. of Philol.* vii. 250 (1877). Noct. Manil. p. 250.

## IV. 633

ut uideamus perhaps should be retained.

*J. of Philol.* xvii. 140.

## IV. 638

†Est itaque ut serpens hominis quae tacta saluius

Disperit ac sese mandendo conficit ipsa.

Read *Excetra ut est serpens*.

*J. of Philol.* xii. 259 (1883).

## IV. 896, 7

hic igitur rebus fit utrumque duabus

†Corporis ut ac nauis uelis uentoque feratur.

Read *Compare ut hac*, sc. mole corporis protrusi atque moti, 'Hereupon it happens to the two things acting in their several ways, that the motion of a ship by sails and wind has its counterpart in this motion of the mass of the body.'

*J. of Philol.* xviii. 271 (1890). Noct. Manil. p. 57.

## IV. 1129, 1130

Et bene parta patrum fiunt anademata mitrae

Interdum in pallam atque talidensia ciaque uertunt.

Read *Alედensia* = Maledensia from Male-dos, presumably an Epirotic (Varr. R.R. ii. 2, 1) town, whence a fine sort of wool was exported: *Cia* is to be explained of the Cean breed of sheep, which was highly

prized and sold for extravagant prices. Ael. H.A. xvi. 32.

*J. of Philol.* xvii. p. 139 and 142 (1888).

## V. 311, 312

Denique non monumenta uirum delapsa uidemus

Quaerere proporro sibi cumque senescere credas!

Read *Aeraque* (Munro) *proporro silicumque senescere petras*.

*J. of Philol.* iii. 267 (1871).

## V. 396

Ignis enim superauit et †ambens multa perussit.

Retain *ambens* = 'compassing,' and restore *ambens* to Stat. Theb. iii. 443 for *amens* of most MSS.

*J. of Philol.* xv. p. 10 (1886).

## V. 881

Hinc illinc par uis ut non sat (sit A) pars esse potissit.

Read *Hinc illinc par uis ut non sat* } *par esse potissit*: 'so that from these limbs or those should come an equal force which at the same time is not equal (or, which is equal enough to form the proper equipoise); i.e. that the human and the equine part of a centaur should coexist in a form which ought to be equal, but, as a fact, cannot be, owing to the different circumstances of the man's and the horse's growth, maturity, etc. Cels. iii. 8 *ut quod idem est, non idem esse uideatur*. Two readings seem to have been conflated into one.

*J. of Philol.* iii. p. 275 (1871).

## V. 1442

Tum mare ueliuolis florebat propter odores.

Read *Tum mare ueliuolis proris florebat opertum*. Stat. Achill. i. 443 feruent portus et operta carinis Stagna.

*J. of Philol.* xviii. 271 (1890).

To these I may add my article on B. VI., which appeared in *J. of Philol.* iii. pp. 260-277 (1871).

ROBINSON ELLIS.

## THREE NEW FRAGMENTS OF CICERO.

I CANNOT find that the following fragments have been incorporated in any edition of Cicero. I cite from the seventh volume of the quarto edition of Jerome, published at Venice in 1769.

comm. in ep. ad Galat. 3 1 (col. 416°):

Graecos leves apud C. Caesarem suggillat  
Tullius dicens: *aut levium Graecorum aut immanium barbarorum.* et pro Flacco:  
*ingenita inquit levitas et erudita vanitas.*

prologus in translationem homiliarum xxxix  
Origenis in Lucam (col. 245 246):

petistis ut, contemptis istiusmodi nugis,  
saltem triginta et novem Adamantii nostri  
in Lucam homilias, sicut in Graeco habentur,  
interpreter: molestam rem et tormento  
similem, *alieno*, ut ait Tullius, *stomacho et non suo scribere*: quam tamen ideo nunc faciam, quia sublimiora non poscitis. This interesting example of *stomachus* is unknown

to the lexicons and to Otto (*Sprichwörter*). The meaning may be illustrated by another passage of Jerome (ep. 82 11 vol. i col. 520 d e):

*sit talis, qualis ante fuit, quando nos suo arbitrio diligebat. verba ei de alieno stomacho non fluant. faciat quod vult, et non quod velle compellitur.*

Further on in the prologue just cited is a reminiscence of Horace (c. iii 27 11):

praetermisi paululum Hebraicarum quaestionum libros, ut ad arbitrium vestrum [he is addressing Paula and Eustochium] lucrativis operis haec, qualiacumque sunt, non mea sed aliena dictarem: praesertim cum a sinistro *oscinem corvum* audiam erocitantem, et mirum in modum de cunctarum avium ridere coloribus, cum totus ipse tenebrosus sit.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

## NOTE ON LUCAN VIII 7.

The context of this passage, describing Pompey's flight after he had passed Larissa [vii 712-24], is as follows:

pavet ille fragorem  
motorum ventis nemorum, comitumque suorum  
qui post terga redit trepidum laterique  
timentem  
exanimat.

The word *redit* has naturally given trouble to commentators. Burman tries to explain it as = 'resounds,' carrying on *fragor* from *fragorem* above. Yet the corrections *ferit venit ruit* are not even plausible. Let me first inquire what is the detail added to the picture by the words *qui post terga redit*. Is the man who startles Pompey (a) joining the party from the direction of Pharsalus, and so catching them up, or (b) turning back to rejoin them with news from the front, having gone on as a scout to see that all was clear ahead? The former makes sense; but can *post terga redit* mean *fugientem sequitur*? If we press *redit* and suppose that the man is rejoining the party, having dropped behind for a time, the sense is to my mind forced and trivial. But, if we take the man to be a scout in advance, we get a new and graphic

detail. Every time the scout comes back to report any news from the front, Pompey is startled by the thought 'here it is at last: our flight is cut off.' This assumes that *post terga redit* means turning back from the general direction of his course. Not very different is I 230 *missa Parthi post terga sagittâ*, where the Parthian rides one way and shoots the other. In short *post terga* with a verb of motion is nearly equal to *in terga*. Can this view be maintained?

Reading lately the *Johannis* of Corippus, I have been struck with the frequent use of *post tergum* and *post terga* in this very sense. Corippus is a notorious imitator of Lucan. He is unfortunately often obscure, but I think the following passages are clear so far as the particular phrase goes.

III 229 *post tergum rediere viri* [? having drunk of the stream, they rejoined the main body], 239-40 *quaerunt dum prendere cautes, post tergum redeunt* [? the climbing down the rocks has the effect of a retreat]. IV 178 *flexit equum post terga fugax* [turned his horse and fled]. 189 *sed nullus post terga redit* [once started in flight, they would not rally at his call]. V 12-3 *domitum post terga reflectens cornipedem frenis* [he turned his horse and rode back again]. 278 *impuleratque duces terror post terga redire*. VI 462-3

*seu fessus Ilaguas conversus post terga redit.* 681-2 *acies pulsae terrore magistri post tergum redeunt.* 758-9 *nigras equus horruit algas, et pavidus post terga redit.* VIII 596 *voluitque in terga redire.* Now *in terga* seems to be the opposite of *in faciem*. And in VI 439-41 we read of the beset Africans

via nulla salutis  
et nullum monstratur iter. *post terga*  
Johannes,  
*in faciem* nimius solis calor.

Here the antithesis is plain, though there is here no verb of motion, and the passage is

not quite in line with the rest. Compare the construction with *respicere*, as *Beluum Africum* 80 § 5 where a force is ordered to raise a shout in the rear of the enemy *ut perturbati ac perterriti respicere post terga cogerentur*. Between Lucan and his sixth century follower I have as yet not found anything bearing on the passage under discussion. But I can hardly suppose that this one passage of Lucan led Corippus to use *post terga* = *in terga* as a regular expression. Is it possible that we have here a fragment of military slang—army-Latin?

W. E. HEITLAND.

#### KRUMBACHER'S BYZANTINE LITERATURE.

*Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches* (527-1453). Von KARL KRUMBACHER. A.O. Professor an der Universität München. Second Edition. (Unter Mitwirkung von A. Ehrhard und H. Gelzer). Munich, 1897. 24 M.

Six years ago I had the pleasure of welcoming in this *Review* the History of Byzantine Literature. If a prophet had declared then that within five years the book would be out of print and that within six we should have in our hands a second edition enlarged to more than double the size of the first, we should have regarded the prediction as absurd, in view of the notorious unpopularity of the subject. But so it has fallen out, and Byzantium must be congratulated. The right word to describe Professor Krumbacher's work must be sought in his own tongue; it is, in the fullest sense of the phrase, 'bahnbrechend.' And Professor Krumbacher has had the good fortune to see it recognized as such by all those who are competent to judge. Professor Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, whose praise is rare and precious, was not extravagant when he said that Krumbacher had almost created a new science. The labour involved in any work conceived on this scale would be vast; but, with Professor Krumbacher's high ideal of thoroughness and accuracy, it must have been simply enormous. There have been a few dissentient voices amid the chorus of praise by which Krumbacher's services have been applauded; there have been a few howls from the impostors whom he has exposed.

But the scurrilities of an Albert Jahn are as harmless as his commendation would be worthless.

The new edition has been increased in three ways. Professor Gelzer of Jena has contributed a succinct sketch of the Byzantine Kaisergeschichte (from A.D. 395 to 1453) in about 150 pages; and Professor Ehrhard of Würzburg has treated the theological and hagiographical literature in somewhat less than 200 pages. Gelzer's name is a sufficient guarantee of the value of his contribution; I hope to have an opportunity of saying something about it elsewhere. The work of Ehrhard forms a most important addition to the book. It is divided into six sections: A. Dogmatik und Polemik; B. Exegese; C. Asketik und Mystik; D. Geistliche Beredsamkeit; E. Hagiographie; F. Katenen (= *συναγ*, systematic selections from ecclesiastical writers). It will form an excellent introduction to the scarce trodden regions of the literature of the Greek Church; of which if any one thinks that he knows anything from reading the standard Church Histories, let him look into Ehrhard's pages and he will find that he knows nothing. It may be added that Professor Ehrhard has recently made a most important original contribution to the subject of Greek hagiography by his study on the composition of the Collection of Symeon Metaphrastes.<sup>1</sup>

Thirdly, and chiefly, the author has added

<sup>1</sup> Die Legendensammlung des Symeon Metaphrastes und ihr ursprünglicher Bestand. (In the Festschrift zum elfhundertjährigen Jubiläum des deutschen Campo Santo in Rom., p. 46 sqq.). 1897.

to his own work 350 pages. Much of this additional material is due to the extraordinary activity of Byzantine research during the last six years. In this activity Professor Krumbacher has had a large share both direct and indirect; it was helped forward by his Literature, and stimulated and concentrated by the foundation of his *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, which led to the institution of the Russian *Vizantiski Vremennik*. But apart from the abundance of new investigations, the bibliography of older works has been largely increased; and the author's studies of MSS. in many libraries have supplied much material. A new section is added on special sciences (medicine, astronomy, mathematics, zoology, law etc.). And here I may record the only complaint I have to make—a complaint which concerns the external form. The book is far too bulky, for a book of constant reference. Why was it not divided at page 638, and brought out in two volumes?

On the bibliography Professor Krumbacher has spent enormous pains, and there is probably hardly anything of any importance that has escaped his notice. There is perhaps no form of research that involves so much pure waste of time as bibliography, and our obligation is all the greater for such a sacrifice. In the *Allgemeine Bibliographie* (p. 1069 *sqq.*), I may call attention to a few small points. P. 1070. The fifth and sixth vols. of Hodgkin's *Italy and her Invaders* appeared in 1895, so that the notice should be: '376-741, six vols. Oxford 1880-1895.' P. 1072 (Unter-Italien). Add M. Schipa, *La migrazione del nome 'Calabria,' Archivio storico per le province napoletane*, 1895, ann. 20, p. 23 *sqq.*, P. 1073. To the works on the fourth century should be added Seeck's important article on Synesius (in *Philologus*, 52, p. 442 *sqq.*), where he has conclusively, as it seems to me, identified the mysterious Typhos of the 'Aegyptian' with Caesarius. Also Seeck's paper, *Die Verwandtenmorde Constantins des Grossen*, *Ztsch. für wiss. Theologie*, 1890, Bd. 33, s. 63 ff. *Ib.* l. 13 from foot; Eudoxia is a misprint for Eudokia. *Ib.* To the sixth century should be added Mr. Bryce's long article on Justinian in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*; and either here or in the paragraph on Southern Italy (p. 1072) might be mentioned von Schubert's *Unterwerfung der Alamannen*. Here too should come H. H. Howorth's *The Avars* (1889, published in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Soc.*, Third Series vol. 1), which contains a full history of the

relations of this people with the Empire and discusses their origin. P. 1077. It might have been added with advantage that the work of Ch. Mijatovich, *Constantine, the last emperor of the Greeks*, is characterised by ignorance of Greek; and on p. 1085 much the same might be said of Stückelberg's *Der konstantinische Patriarchat*, for which 'ungenügend' is hardly strong enough. P. 1078 D; I may note a paper of my own, *Charles the Great and the Empress Irene*, published in *Hermathena*, 1891. P. 1086, D. Add Mommsen, *Protecores Augusti*, *Ephem. Epigr.* V. 121 *sqq.* P. 1107, M; Xénopol's *Histoire des Roumains de la Dacie Trajane* (1896) must have appeared just too late to be recorded. *Ib.* N. Add C. Grot, *Moravia i. Madiari s. polovini ix do nachala x veka* (Warsaw). P. 1099 G. Add R. von Scala, *Ueber die wichtigsten Beziehungen des Orients zum Occidente*. P. 1109. Add Arthur J. Evans, *Antiquarian Researches in Illyricum*, 1883 and 1885 (very important). P. 1106 L. Add, on the Tetraxite Goths, Vasilievski, *Zhitie Ioanna Gotskago*, in *Journ. Min.* 1878 Bd. 195, s. 105 ff.; and the same reference should be given in the notice of the *Biography of Johannes of Gotthia* on p. 197.

It is quite impossible in a bibliography on such a large scale always to go behind titles. What is professedly a work on one writer may have great importance for the study of other writers, and should consequently be mentioned under their names. Thus we miss under Zonaras a mention of the article of S. P. Shestakov on Candidus (in the *Odessa Lietopis* for 1894), which throws light on Zonaras B. xiv. (and also concerns Theophanes and Nicephorus Callistus).

Prof. Krumbacher refers to the *Ἱταλο-ελληνικά* of S. Zampelios, but not to his *Βυζαντινὰὶ Μελέται* (Athens, 1857), a series of essays, dealing especially with the Iconoclasts and with the relations of the Eastern Empire with the West. They have a right to a place in his bibliography (under various heads) and some of them are still worth consulting. As the book is little known, it may be useful to give a list of the contents. (1) *συστατικὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς Βυζαντινῆς κοινωνίας* (deals with the demes, guilds, etc.) p. 65. (2) *πνευματικὴ ἀνεξαρτησία τοῦ Ἑλληνισμοῦ*, p. 96. (3) *Ἡράκλειος*, p. 114. (4) *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ κατὰστασις*, p. 127. (5) *Μωάμεδ καὶ Σαρακηνοί*, p. 167. (6) *Λέων ὁ Ἰσάυρος*. (7) *Εἰκονομαχία*. (8) *τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἱταλίαν* (sc. in the eighth century), p. 252. (9) *Φράγκων ἐπέμβασις*, p. 274. (10) *Βασί-*



λεία Κωνσταντίνου (sc. Constantine V.), p. 292. (11) Πατισμοῦ προαγωγή, p. 327. (12) Εἰρήνη καὶ μέγας Κάρολος, p. 355. (13) Ἀνατολῆς καὶ Δύσεως ὁροθεσία, p. 396. (14-16) σχέσεις τῶν δύο αὐτοκρατοριῶν, p. 428. (17) πρεσβεία Λαυτιπράνδου, p. 518. (18) Γλώσσης περιπέτεια, p. 574-682.

P. 94, in the enumeration of the theological works of Blemmydes, "Die Vita Pauli vom Berge Latros ist aus diesem Verzeichnis [d. h. des Demetrakopoulos] zu streichen." The reasons should be given; for the Life of Paulus Junior in Cod. Paris. 1195 is distinctly ascribed to Blemmydes and appears thus in Omont's Catalogue. The reasons will be found in the preface to Delehaye's edition of the *Vita S. Pauli junioris in Monte Latro*, 1892.

P. 236, 3. In the preface to my ed. of Gibbon, vol. 1, I have retracted the view (referred to by Krumbacher) as to the authorship of the Secret History of Procopius and have signified my general acceptance of the conclusions of Haury; which the very thorough treatment of the contents of the work by Panchenko in the last few numbers of the *Vizantiski Vremennik* has gone to confirm.

P. 404, Zacharias of Mytilene (the genuine Books, 3-6) was translated and printed privately in 1892 by Dr. F. J. Hamilton under the title *The Ecclesiastical History of Zacharias Rhetor*. This version, revised, will appear in the series of Methuen's Byzantine Texts, along with the most important parts of the Chronicle in which this work of Zacharias was incorporated.

Nothing can be better or clearer than Prof. Krumbacher's summing up of the still unsettled controversies in Byzantine Literature; for example, the sections headed Johannes Malalas (§ 140), Johannes von Antiochia (§ 141), Georgios Monachos (§ 147). As it is quite impossible, within the limits of a short review, to go through even one division of this immense work, it will be more profitable to make some remarks on one of these vexed questions, and offer a small contribution to the subject.

The labour that has been expended on the 'Malalasfrage' has not been in vain. A number of conclusions have been solidly established; and a certain amount of agreement has been attained. It is indeed a remarkable example of a puzzle being gradually solved, not by the ingenuity of a single man, but by the labours of a great many independent workers approaching the question from different points of view. Among those who have made contributions

may be specially mentioned Mommsen, Sotiriadis, Gelzer, Patzig, Noack, E. W. Brooks, Shestakov, and most recently C. E. Gleye. The following are the main points which may be regarded as definitely settled:

(1) The author of the chronicle preserved in Cod. Baroc. 128, who is called Johannes Malálas (= rhetor) by John of Damascus, is identical with Johannes Rhetor (= malálas) cited by Evagrius. (This identification is accepted by Krumbacher, and has been proved to demonstration in the very important article of Gleye in *Byz. Ztsch.*, 1896, Bd. 5, 422 *sqq.*)

(2) Johannes Malalas wrote in the sixth century between A.D. 530 and 540. Whether he was also writing as late as A.D. 565-575, cannot be determined.

(3) Johannes Malalas is a distinct person from Johannes of Antioch — whether we identify with this name the Salmasian (so Patzig) or the Constantinian excerpts. Johannes of Antioch was subsequent to Malalas.

(4) The text which we possess (in the Oxford MS.) is only an abridgment of the original Chronicle of Malalas. But in a variety of excerpts, in the Slavonic versions, in later authors who used the original Malalas, we have a great deal of material for restoring large parts of the Chronicle to their primitive form.

(5) The Chronicle is not all of a piece. It appeared in two editions, of which the first contained only Books 1-17 and a few pages of Bk. 18 (up to p. 429, 9 ed Bonn), ending with the first months of A.D. 528. The paragraph from p. 428, 8, to 429, 9, formed the *epilogue* to this edition (as Gleye has rightly pointed out, *op. cit.*), which was published before A.D. 540. A second edition bringing the work up to date appeared in the reign of Justin. This came down at least as far as Justinian's death in the year A.D. 565. In this edition not only was new matter added, but some changes were made in the older work. *E.g.* what originally formed the end of Bk. 17 (namely the first acts of Justinian and the *epilogue*) were placed at the beginning of the new Book 18, and in the notice of the accession of Justinian (p. 425) the number of years of his reign was added. (The establishment of these facts is chiefly due to Mr. Brooks, M. Shestakov, and Dr. Gleye.)

These conclusions lead of course to new questions. Was the second edition brought out by Malalas himself, and was he the author of the eighteenth Book? In regard to this, it is to be observed that the eighteenth

Book seems to have been written at Constantinople and not like the earlier part of the work at Antioch. It is also to be remembered that Malalas was a monophysite and that his work was subsequently revised by an orthodox editor, who cut out and altered the utterances of the author's theological opinions, but failed to obliterate all the traces of the cloven hoof. What then was the relation of this orthodox redaction to the new edition after the death of Justinian?

In connexion with this problem C. E. Gleye has collected considerable evidence to show that the second edition was considerably abbreviated (loc. cit. 430-441). His conclusions may be put thus. So far as Books 1-17 are concerned, the text of Cod. Barocc. represents the abridgment of an abridgment; for Book 18, it is the abridgment of the original work. We have in fact to distinguish three redactions of Books 1-17: (a) the original work (coming down to the first year of Justinian) which was used in this shape by Evagrius; (b) an edition largely abbreviated and modified, augmented by Book 18, and published after A.D. 565. This edition was used by author of Chron. Pasch., by Theophanes etc. (c) The abridgment preserved in the Oxford MS. I may mention one item in the evidence which Dr. Gleye has adduced. Evagrius using Malalas (Johannes Rhetor) notices the foundation of Daras. But the form of the name in our Malalas is Doras, not merely in the Cod. Barocc. (which, by the way, has τὰ δὲ δῶπας, not τὸ δὲ δῶπας) but in the edition used by Chron. Pasch. and the Slavonic translator. It would be hard to prove that Evagrius did not on his own account write Daras, instead of Doras in his source; but, when we take this case in connexion with others, it seems probable that Malalas wrote Daras, and that Doras (with the etymology δῶπυ) was introduced in the later redaction. If the arguments of Gleye sustain the criticism of further research, they might lead to an important conclusion. They suggest that the true Johannes Rhetor or Malalas wrote his chronicle, as we should expect from a professor of rhetoric, in the Greek prose which educated writers used, and that the redactor who uttered the second edition transformed the style into the 'naive volkstümliche Gräzität' which makes it such an important monument from a linguistic point of view.

But there are difficulties. Although the eighteenth Book takes us into the atmosphere of Constantinople, the Antiochene author

seems to accompany us for a few years. In the first place, we find immediately after the Epilogue, the formula ὡς προεῖπον, 'as I said above' (p. 429, 10). A Byzantine Continuer does not usually attempt to pose as the original author. Next, we have the notice of Antioch (p. 443-4), which suggests local knowledge and interest. Then we have the remarkably full account of the Persian War (p. 460-471), which gives the impression of having been written by one who followed its course from Syria rather than from Constantinople. Further, there is a curious notice in the Paschal Chronicle, which has a bearing on Malalas. That Chronicler followed Malalas in his description of the massacre in the hippodrome on the last day of the Nika-riot. Thirty-five thousand people were slaughtered, and out of that vast multitude the name of only one is handed down to fame. The circumstance that the victim who is thus singled out was a man of Antioch is surely of great significance. There can be no doubt, I think, that the Paschal Chronicler derived the fact from Malalas; and therefore the Antiochene influence is still present in the first part of the eighteenth Book.

Another question is; where did the second edition of the Chronicle end? The Latin Laterculus in Cod. Vat. 277 (recently published by Mommsen, Chron. Min., 3, p. 424 sqq.), which was based on the Chronicle of Malalas, ends not with Justinian, but with the ninth year of Justin ii. ('Iustinus regn ann viiii.' p. 437). Hence it is inferred that Malalas ended with the ninth year of Justin. I think Professor Krumbacher is prudent in showing some reserve about accepting this inference. I feel considerable difficulty in admitting that the Chronicle from which the Cod. Barocc. was abridged went beyond A.D. 565. There is only one fol. missing at the end of the Cod. Barocc., and any one who knows the large writing of the scribe of that MS. will find it hard to believe that—every allowance being made for the use of contractions which he began to adopt in the penultimate folio—he could have compressed nine years of Justin as well as the last three years of Justinian into the space. It therefore seems to me practically certain that the second edition went down only to the death of Justinian; and we may suppose that the original Latin epitome of Malalas on which our Laterculus (composed in the eighth century) depends was drawn up in A.D. 574-5 and that the Latin compiler added *suo Marte* the nine years of Justin. Perhaps he regarded

Justin's reign as at an end, when Tiberius was proclaimed Caesar; for Justin had practically retired from the administration, and it is noteworthy that Menander dates events in 576 not by the years of Justin but by the years of Tiberius Caesar (fr. 43 *περὶ τὸ δεύτερον ἔτος τῆς Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ἡγεμονίας*, cp. fr. 42, Müller p. 244).

Professor Krumbacher is hardly right in saying (here he has followed Patzig) that the Paschal Chronicler used a Malalas which ended with the seventeenth Book. I had long ago satisfied myself that Patzig's argument in his first Program (Unerkannt und unbekannt geliebene Malalas-fragmente, p. 15-17), to prove this thesis, was false, and could be refuted from the very episode on which he himself attempts to base it,—the episode of the Nika-revolt. Dr. Gleye came to the same conclusion and, as he has set forth his reasons (op. cit. p. 441 *sqq.*), I need not go into the question here. But on the other hand, I think that Dr. Gleye seems inclined to exaggerate the compass of the narrative of 'Malalas' in its original form. He seems disposed to think (though he admits that he cannot prove) that 'the eighteenth Book of the Malalas-work was the sole source of both Chron. Pasch. and Theophanes.' The reverse, I think, may be shown clearly from Theophanes.

A clumsy compiler like Theophanes distinguishes himself from a clever compiler like Zonaras, by inability to hide the sutures of his patch-work. Now it seems to me that there can be no clearer or stronger presumption of the use of different authorities than when a compiler introduces a new preface or introductory formula in the middle of a narrative. But this is what we find in the account of the Nika revolt by Theophanes. He begins with a general Introduction containing a summary of the whole episode (the coronation of Hypatius, the burning of the city, the slaughter of the people in the Hippodrome) taken straight from Theodorus Lector (= Cramer, An. Par. ii. p. 112):

τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει . . . . . γέγονε τοῦ λεγομένου Νίκα ἡ ἀνταρσία. Then follows the summary; and then we meet a *second Introduction*, γέγονε δὲ ἡ ἀταξία τοῦ Νίκα τῷ πρώτῳ τοιούτῳ, followed by the famous conversation in the Hippodrome (ed. de Boor p. 181). But after this scene, Theophanes begins anew with a *third Introduction* (de Boor, p. 184 l. 3); and this third preface corresponds to the words in which 'Malalas' (p. 473, 5) introduces his narrative.

The MSS. of Theophanes have the *παῖς*-

τόρον, which has no meaning here, and should obviously be corrected to *ἀλαστόρον*.

The inference is that at this point Theophanes passed from another source to the Malalas Chronicle, and awkwardly adopted the prefatory words of the latter, just as he had before passed from Theodorus Lector to this second source and, less awkwardly, adopted its opening words. If the altercation in the Hippodrome had been in the original Malalas Chronicle, it would have followed, and not preceded, these prefatory words, and it is quite inconceivable, that Theophanes would have deliberately composed a new preface and then inserted the introductory formula of Malalas out of its order. Theophanes and the Paschal Chronicler, who gives a very short notice of this altercation, had a second source (a Constantinopolitan Chronicle) before them.

This argument is confirmed by the noteworthy fact that Theophanes, though copying 'Malalas,' omits altogether the remarkable second scene in the Hippodrome on the Ides of January, which is described by 'Malalas' (p. 474). This was the occasion on which the Blues and Greens combined; it was a far more important occasion than the other. Why has Theophanes omitted it? The only intelligible reason is that he confused the two occasions and thought 'Malalas' was here describing more briefly the same negotiations which had been related more fully by his other source. If 'Malalas' had contained the earlier Dialogue also, there would have been no temptation to confuse the two scenes, and consequently no reason to omit the second.

While I am on the subject of the relation of Theophanes to Malalas, I may take the opportunity of pointing out a method to which not only compilers but historians sometimes resort, and to which in one instance Theophanes has resorted with the result of leading his critics astray. Under the year 571-2, in the reign of Justin, Theophanes describes the embassy of Julian, an imperial messenger (*μαγιστριανός*), to Arethas king of the Axumites, and his reception at that king's court. Now 'Malalas' described in identical words under the year 530, in the reign of Justinian, the mission of an unnamed ambassador to Elesboas king of the Axumites. The object of both missions was the same,—to incite Axum against Persia, and was in both cases successful. Now it is always assumed that Theophanes has simply misdated by forty years the event described by 'Malalas.' I

am utterly unable to imagine how such a misdating could have happened, except by the assumption of an accidental transposition of pages in the copy of Malalas which Theophanes consulted—assuming 'Malalas' to have come down to the ninth year of Justin's reign. It need hardly be said that this is an extremely unlikely assumption and could not be entertained without other evidence. But there are decisive objections against the theory of a mere confusion of dates. (1) The names of the kings are different; one is Elesboas, the other is Arethas. (2) The names of the envoys are different. The envoy sent by Justinian to Elesboas has no name in Malalas, but we know from other sources that he was Nonnosus; whereas the name of the envoy, who according to Theophanes was sent by Justin, is Julian. We are therefore not justified in identifying the two missions (as is generally done and as M. Duchesne does in his valuable study: *Eglises séparées*, p. 329); and the later mission in the reign of Justin is perfectly credible in view of the charge brought against the Romans by Chosroes: τοὺς Ὀμηρίτας πρὸς ἀπόστασιν ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἐπομείβεσθαι. Julian was, no doubt, sent to the Homerite court as well. The point is that Theophanes borrowed the language in which

Malalas described the mission of Nonnosus, and applied it to the mission of Julian. Perhaps he even confounded Homerites and Axumites. In the same way the great Gibbon himself, in his narrative of the battle in which the Emperor Decius fell, has 'ventured to copy from Tacitus the picture of a similar engagement between a Roman army and a German tribe.'

But I must return to Professor Krumbacher's book. The notices of MSS. are far more frequent and abundant in the second edition than in the first. When the time comes for the preparation of a third edition, it would be well worth while to aim at giving for every writer as complete a list as possible of all the extant MSS. of any importance. This would be a laborious work, and I do not suggest that Professor Krumbacher should undertake it himself. But it could be easily done in a year or eighteen months, under his guidance, by one of his pupils. The first section in small print under each name would then be 'Handschriften,' and the second 'Ausgaben.' It may seem ungrateful, having got so much, to ask for more, but even in the halls of Olympus one will always find something to wish for.

J. B. BURY.

#### BRUHN'S *IPHIGENIE AUF TAURIS*.

E. BRUHN'S *Iphigenie auf Tauris*. Berlin, Weidmann. M. 2.40.

THE Tauric Iphigenia has always attracted its full share of attention among the plays of Euripides. The interest and beauty of the play itself, together with the many questions it suggests, make it an excellent one for the class room, and there are many passages in it that invite and perhaps baffle the skill of the critic. Of special editions there is no lack although they are of very unequal merit, but, to mention some of the more recent, neither Wecklein, Weil, England nor Köchly leaves one satisfied. This new edition by Bruhn finds ample justification in the fact that it is really better calculated than any one of its predecessors to lead one to a good understanding and adequate appreciation of the play.

In general the editor has been conservative in the establishment of the text. In comparing this edition with that of Köchly,

of which this is a revision, I have noted some two hundred passages, counting continuous passages as units, in which the text has been changed, and in a large majority of cases there is either a return to the MSS. reading or to something less remote from it. Many needless changes have been done away with: thus we find Ἀχαιοὺς in vs. 13, παροῦς ἀπὸντι in 62, προσείσας in 370, ὄνομα in 905, οὐ μνησθέντας in 1116, γὰς εἰνὰς in 1267, etc. Often the MSS. reading is kept, even when corrupt, because in Bruhn's opinion no correction that is satisfactory has been proposed. Among these are passages which, as nearly all will agree, still await correction e.g. 113, 189 f., 343, 432, 452 f., 633, 782 (which Bruhn is inclined to throw out), 912, 1134, 1150f., 1246 and 1371. Bruhn includes 288, 294, 336, 455, 521, 836, and 914, in regard to all of which he seems to me over-cautious.

Sometimes the traditional text is saved by the assumption of a lacuna, and here



again Bruhn seems to me to go too far. Something has clearly been lost after 1014 and after 1468, but gaps are also indicated after 98, 259, 292, 477, 1349, 1394, 1405, and, in the commentary, 21. At 21 this is needless. At 98 it serves to keep μάθοιμεν, but λάθοιμεν is surely the right reading (the original reading too, if we may trust Wilamowitz, *Analecta* p. 32). Without treating that vexed passage in detail, it seems clear to me that two ways of entering the temple are suggested, by climbing the walls or by forcing the doors. Despite critics πότρεα does lead up to ἡ in 99. I accept Kirchhoff's κλιμάκων as certain; yet in thus scaling the walls they were sure to be observed, hence πῶς ἂν λάθοιμεν. In 100 ὃν οὐδὲν ἴσμεν must be corrupt, but ὅδ' and ἔσμεν are so patent that emendation is easy. Again at 259 the assumption of a lacuna makes it possible to retain οὐδέπω, but surely Seidler's οὐδ' ἐπεὶ is preferable and we do not need to transpose with Wecklein. At 292 the lacuna with ταῦτα for ταῦτα gives a new interpretation, but, I think, an incorrect one. ταῦτα is weak, for we miss a reference to Orestes' hallucination and if we read χ' 'φασκ' all runs smoothly. The difficulty in ἡλίσσεται is not insuperable. In 477 Bruhn is again enabled to keep the traditional text by assuming that some such verse as ὁπῆνιχ' ἤξει χῶπόθεν κάθ' ὄντα has fallen out. This is possible, but it is at least equally likely that κακόν is corrupt and Schmidt's ἄκος is very close. At 1349 a lacuna of some length is assumed with great probability. No one can read that passage without feeling that something is wrong, and this seems the only remedy: see Bruhn's note on 1345. Again at 1394 the same device makes it possible to keep νεός. I read σκάφος, however, without hesitation. The frequent collocation of the words gives a reasonable ground for the intrusion of νεός, and the corruption of the next line, calling for a genitive, may have aided it (Wecklein). Lastly we have a lacuna at 1405, but quite needlessly.

As to rejected verses (printed with smaller type as in Kirchhoff) Bruhn is conservative. He regards nine trimeters as spurious (40 f., 59 f., 720, 957, 1025 f., and 1441 b.), as against twenty-one in England, thirteen each in Wecklein, Dindorf, and Nauck, five in Schöne and four in Kirchhoff. Of 40 f., and 1025 f. I speak below; as to the others, 59 f. are thrown out by nearly every one, 720 may be an interpolation of the familiar type to supply a supposedly missing noun for the τό in the preceding

verse, and 1441 b. has the warrant of L alone. In the case of 957, however, Bruhn's objection does not seem to me well-grounded. There is no real reason to object to the open statement οὐνεκ' ἦν μητρὸς φονεύς after 940: Orestes has told it all in 556. A real conservatism is, however, shown in the retention of 84, 736, 1071, etc.

In the adoption of readings, on the other hand, considerable rashness is shown. Bruhn, as was to be expected, shows a thorough acquaintance with recent Euripidean criticism and adds some conjectures of his own. Of other scholars Wilamowitz is the one oftenest quoted. I give but a few notes:

οὐνεκ' is changed to εὔνεκ' in 8 but not in 1388 or 1469; in 295 Wilamowitz's θανόμενον is no improvement and leaves συσταλέντες ungrounded; in 352 Wecklein is followed in what seems to me a wholly wrong understanding of the passage (see below); in 481 Hirzel's μακρὰν—χθονὸς is accepted to the great detriment of the sought-for contrast with the preceding verse, which surely means: 'Long have ye been on your voyage hither'; in 592 Heimsoeth is followed: I prefer Köchly's χοῖς ἐγὼ θέλω. In 895 he assumes, with Weil and Badham, mention of a φύσις κεκραμένη (Aesch. *Prom.* 116) between θεοὶ and βροτοί. It is certainly readable and by no means lacks support, but, despite Matthiae, why object to τί τῶν ἀδοκίμων? Translate 'Who, be it god or mortal or unlooked for chance?' Has not the desire to connect πόρον with τῶν ἀδοκίμων as in the 'wretched tail-piece' been the real ground for imagining a difficulty? In 951 Bruhn, after Wilamowitz, reads σιγῇ δ' ἐτεκίρναντο πρόσφθεγτόν μ' but that can hardly be what Euripides wrote. On 1134, however, his argument against πρότονοι is conclusive.

The commentary is in the main judicious and is characterised by an admirable frankness and sanity. This is marked e.g. in 372, where the naturalness of Iphigenia's words is recognised; in 376 in the justification of πολλά; in 616 on προβημία as against προμηθία (Coleridge, 'Thy good will for him must be something great!'); in 685 in the recognition of the dramatic import of Py-lades' climax; in 898 where again we have truth to nature; in 1023 in retaining οὐκ ἂν δυνάμην. In all of these passages one can only say that he who interprets them otherwise does not know Euripides or has no feeling for his greatest beauties. On the other hand we miss this sanity of judgment on 52 where Bruhn is rather captious

as to the 'voice'; on 57 as to the import of the dream; on 294 as to the *μυκήματα* of the Erinyes, *et passim*.

In some passages he seems to me wrong. In the note on 33 he says, in objecting to the view that 31-33 are interpolated, 'Denn dann würde Iphigenie den Zweifel, den sie 389 erhebt, überhaupt nicht erheben können, weil sie ja durch die Göttin selbst als Priesterin eingesetzt wäre.' That must mean that he takes *Θέας* as the subject of *τίθησι*, yet on 34 he gives as subject *Ἀρτεμις* and is certainly right. In 67 *ἔστι* is to be supplied, not *ἦ* (the same error in Blaydes on *Ar. Nub.* 493); in 71 he makes *σοι* depend upon *χρεών*, but that is certainly wrong. It is needless to invent instances of *χρή* and its synonyms taking a dative and infinitive, and *συνδοκεῖν* has better warrant if construed *χρεών ταῦτα συνδοκεῖν καὶ σοί*. cf. *Ar. Aves* 811. In many points of interpretation one feels inclined to differ. Certainly, despite Wilamowitz, one does not rightly understand Euripides' Iphigenia who speaks of her 'wilde Freude' in 259. That may perhaps do if the words be put in the mouth of the herdsman as in Wecklein's arrangement, but in the light of 221 ff. and 385 ff. we cannot so read Iphigenia's character; even 350 does not warrant it.

Some passages call for a more detailed examination.

34-41. A full discussion of this vexed passage would be out of place here, but I am convinced that, rightly understood, it is (at least from 37 on) sound, and that 40 f. should not be thrown out. Harsh 35 and 36 certainly are; it is only a question as to whether they are unbearably so. To change *τοῖσιν* to a demonstrative simply makes *ἦδεται* a principal verb and that helps but little. Hermann long ago said of these lines, 'Verissima est librorum scriptura nec quidquam habet difficultatis si quis aposiopesis attendat', and he may after all be right. To put in a principal verb in the place of *Ἀρτεμις* makes matters smoother, but why in the world should *θεά* have been glossed? It could have been no one but Artemis, and the two words are not closer together than in 783

λέγ' οὐνεκ' ἔλαφον ἀντιδοῦσά μου θεῷ  
"Ἀρτεμις ἔσωσέ μ'.

Compare 243

θεῇ φίλον πρόσφαγμα καὶ θνητῶν  
Ἀρτέμιδι,

and again 1435

ποῖ ποῖ διωγμὸν τόνδε πορθομένης ἀναξ  
Θέας;

Could we accept Mekler's *δρᾶν θέμις ἑορτᾶς* we could assume *Ἀρτεμις* to have arisen from a corruption, but no one else fancies Euripides wrote that.

After we pass vs. 36 the only difficulty is the asyndeton in 40. Kirchhoff's *θείου* and Kvicala's *θεῶν* would remove that, but, aside from other objections, *θεῶν* was the original reading. The other alternative is to throw out 40 f., with Bruhn and others, as made up to bring the passage in harmony with 621 f. Against this view I offer the following considerations.

Iphigenia says in effect, 'I was made priestess here; the rest I will not tell.' She cannot speak of the horrid rite of human sacrifice save in terms that might anger the goddess. Yet even as she says this she does speak out, impelled by her horror of the situation in which she is placed (cf. 221 ff., 380 ff.), and *θεῶν* points this impassioned outburst, 'For, you must know, I have to sacrifice.' (For somewhat similar outbursts, where after *σινῶ* or its equivalent the thing is none the less told, cf. *Eur. Orest.* 14, *Electra* 1245; and one may almost compare *Aesch. Ag.* 36 ff.) She *must* speak out, (how weak is this outburst if *κατάρχομαι* be made the main verb!) but in her deep feeling says too much, and, eager to set herself right, adds these explanatory lines. 'That is to say, I begin the rite—the slaying is done by others.' Harsh the asyndeton may be, but if one can read between the lines, as a dramatic critic must, not intolerably so, and I find a similar instance in *Thuc.* 4. 10, 3 which I explain in exactly the same way. There Demosthenes, in exhorting his troops to stand firm, says, *τοῦ τε γὰρ χωρίου τὸ δυσέμβατον ἡμέτερον νομίζω—μενόντων μὲν ἡμῶν ξύμμαχον γίγνεται ὑποχωρήσασιν δὲ καίπερ χαλεπὸν ὃν εὖπορον ἔσται μηδενὸς κωλύοντος*. 'I maintain that the roughness of the place is in our favour, that is to say, if we hold our ground it is an ally, but men in retreat will find, etc.'

*μὲν* is found in E and in Dionysius. Editors generally insert *ὃ* from Dionysius before *μενόντων*, but, thus explained, do we need it?

351 ff. καὶ τοῦτ' ἄρ' ἦν ἀληθές, ἡχθόμην, φίλαι,  
οἱ δυστυχεῖς γὰρ τοῖσιν εὐτυχέστεροις  
αὐτοὶ κακῶς πράξαντες οὐ φρονοῦσιν εἶ.

So the MSS. Dindorf corrected ἡχθόμεν to ἡσθόμεν, but, with that exception, the passage is kept by Schöne, Köchly, Ziegler<sup>2</sup>, Klotz, and Weil<sup>1</sup> (I have not access to Weil<sup>2</sup>). In this case the clause αὐτοὶ κ.τ.λ. must be felt as causal, or as a re-emphasizing of δυστυχέως. This is however mere tautology.

As early as 1813, Seidler suggested that we should read καλῶς, = 'Seeing that they have themselves known prosperity.' The sentiment is then the very common one that it is the change from prosperity to adversity that embitters the heart (cf. 1118 ff.). This change, easy in itself—the MSS. have κακῶν for καλῶν in 378—has found wide acceptance, e.g. Badham, Dindorf, Witzschel, Paley and Nauck. Hartung, however, pointed out that we should certainly have some such word as ποτὲ or πάλαι for this sense and, while his αἰθῆς will not suffice, Dindorf's πάλαι καλῶς is an improvement. Rauchenstein in the Jahrb. for 1864 and again in 1876 proposed αὐτοὶ ποτ' εὖ and somewhat similar is Engers' (R. M. 17, 612) αὐτῶν κακῶς, 'Having but recently fallen upon adversity.' For other guesses see Köchly's critical note.

Against this interpretation, which meets the requirement of 351 in being a general maxim, it has been objected that Orestes and Pylades cannot properly be called εὐτυχέστεροι by Iphigenia. She is certainly δυστυχής, and dwells pathetically upon her present lot contrasted with the happy promise of her girlhood; but these men are still more wretched than she, for far from their homes they are to perish miserably by a most horrible fate. This objection is, I think, unanswerable; various attempts have been made to meet it but without success. Mekler (1891) keeps the MSS. text but considers the εὐτυχέστεροι to be, not Orestes and Pylades, but Helen and Menelaus who are mentioned in the verses immediately following. So too Schulze (De Versibus Suspectis et Interpolatis Iph. Taur. Fab. Eur. 1881) who attributes this view to all who retain εὐτυχέστεροι, which he holds to be necessarily corrupt.

This view, i.e. that εὐτυχέστεροι refers to Helen and Menelaus I hold to be utterly untenable. 'Who e'er ye be,' says Iphigenia, 'ye shall find me relentless, for—', and the following clause must give the ground for her attitude toward them.

Another alternative is to accept the reading proposed by Wecklein in the Jahrb. for 1876 and given in his two editions (1876 and 1888):

οἱ δυστυχεῖς γὰρ τοῖσι δυστυχέστεροις  
αὐτοὶ κακῶς πράξαντες οὐ φρονοῦσιν εὖ.

This he interprets: 'Die Unglücklichen (wie Iphigenie die im fremden Lande leben muss) meinen es nicht gut mit den noch Unglücklicheren (das sind die Fremden die sterben sollen) wenn sie selber Leid erfahren haben (wie Iphigenie in dem Glauben dass ihr Bruder tot sei).' To this England objects that, while fitting the present situation, it is not sufficiently general to be called a maxim. To me a stronger objection is that it is too involved. Here Bruhn follows Wecklein.

Metzger reads, feeling the same difficulty,

οἱ δυστυχεῖς καὶ τοῖσι δυστυχέστεροις  
αὐτοὶ πρὶν εὖ πράξαντες, etc.

and somewhat similar is Weil's

τοῖς δυσπότημοις γὰρ οἱ ποτ' εὐτυχέστεροι.

Others have tried excision, but it seems clear to me that the sense of the whole passage, read in the light of the context, is only satisfied if we read

οἱ δυστυχεῖς γὰρ τοῖσιν εὐτυχέστεροις  
ὅταν κακῶς πράξωσιν οὐ φρονοῦσιν εὖ.

We have only to assume that some scribe misunderstood the passage and wrote αὐτοὶ over the ὅταν to indicate what he took to be the subject. This could easily have crowded out ὅταν, and then the subjunctive was necessarily changed to the participle. This gives us a general maxim, true and fitting the situation, and absolutely in harmony with Iphigenia's preceding words. It also gives an easy transition to the mention of those εὐτυχέστεροι whom she would most gladly see fall into woe, Helen and Menelaus.

Kirchhoff evidently felt this in proposing αὐτοῖς κακῶς πράξουσιν, but that does not satisfy one. The αὐτοῖς and the cumulation of datives are odd. Köchly says of Kirchhoff's text 'Entschieden falsch,' but it is the only reading heretofore proposed that gives the meaning called for. England and Bauer follow Kirchhoff.

1025 f. Iph. ὡς δὲ σκότος λαβόντες ἐκσωθῆμεν  
αὖν;

Or. κλεπτῶν γὰρ ἡ νύξ, τῆς δ' ἀλη-  
θείας τὸ φῶς.

Bruhn along with most modern editors throws out this couplet. Markland was

first to do so, saying of 1026 'ex Novo Testamento conflatus videtur.' The neuter form *σκόρος* has also been objected to (Dindorf) but, in the light of *Herc. Fur.* 563 and 1159, and Photius' statement that Ameipsias used both forms, without good reason. As to the *ὡς ἂν* we have but to say that it is not final. The point I wish to emphasize is that those who throw the verses out misinterpret them. Bruhn's note is to me remarkable: 'Wunderlich ist es, dass Iphigenie den Vorschlag erst weiter spezialisiert ehe sie ihn ablehnt; aber ganz thöricht ist das *Pathos* oder der *Sarkasmus*, mit dem Orest selber seinen Vorschlag als *unwürdig* bezeichnet—er, der doch vorher kein Wort gegen den ganz ähnlichen Vorschlag des Pylades einzuwenden hatte,' (the italics are mine,) and others write to the same effect: 'L'argu-

ment dont se sert Oreste est plus propre à refuter son opinion qu'à la soutenir' (Weil). Surely the γὰρ in 1026 is the γὰρ of *assent*: 'Aye for night is the time for thieves (and such Phoebus wills that we be) etc.', and Orestes is *not* objecting to the plan. The Taurians use κλέπτοντες in 1359, and in 1400 Iphigenia prays καὶ κλοπαῖς σύγγνωθ' ἐμαῖς.

Misprints in the book are very few, save in matters of accent and breathings, where they are too frequent. I have observed further *ιένας* for *ιέναι* in the note on 699. ἀμύρρατον for αἰμ- in the critical note on 225, and pervulgatissimum, as two words, in the note on 649. None are, however, misleading.

AUGUSTUS T. MURRAY.

LELAND STANFORD JR. UNIV. November 1896.

#### GREENIDGE'S GREEK CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY.

*A Handbook of Greek Constitutional History*, by A. H. J. GREENIDGE. London: Macmillan and Co., 1896. 5s. net.

THIS is one of a series of handbooks of archaeology and antiquities, which made a good beginning with Mr. Gardner's well-known work on Greek sculpture. Mr. Greenidge tells us in the preface that he has been anxious to redeem his subject from the charge of dullness; if this has been his object, it cannot be denied that he has succeeded. He can be original even in the treatment of the most familiar themes; the style is fresh and vigorous, and the explanations are, as a rule, clear. The book is, from its nature, mainly intended for beginners, by whom it is likely to be extensively used, but at the same time more advanced students may gather not a few suggestive hints from its pages.

The author's purpose, as stated in the preface, is to sketch the history of Greek public law, and to represent the different types of states in the order of their development. It was, perhaps, inevitable that one half, and that decidedly the more valuable half of the book, should be occupied with Sparta and Athens; in the author's own words, 'The disproportionate length' at which the constitutions of these two states are treated is 'the result of accident, not of design.' Until accident

restores to us some of the missing 157 πολιτεῖαι, this disproportion is not likely to be remedied. At the beginning there are some chapters upon the earlier forms of government, upon colonisation, and upon oligarchy, and the subjects of federal governments and Hellenism are dealt with in the two concluding chapters; the central part of the work is devoted to Sparta and Athens.

In the earlier chapters the sections which treat of colonisation and international law bring together a good deal of information which a beginner cannot easily find elsewhere. The section at the beginning of Chapter IV., on the different forms of government, will do good service, if only by calling attention to the fact, which is commonly obscured in works on Greek constitutional history, that in Greece proper the city-state, in the strict sense of the term, was the exception rather than the rule, even in the fifth century B.C. As Mr. Greenidge puts it 'the πόλις as a wholly independent political unit in this portion of Hellas is something of a fiction.' The treatment of oligarchy, on the other hand, is a little disappointing. Surely, it deserves more than thirteen pages; nor is the want of information a sufficient excuse for this disproportionate brevity. More might have been said, which, I think, would have been worth saying. A still more serious objection may



be taken to this part of the book, on the ground of the author's view that oligarchy was a transitional form of government, and 'one which could seldom stand alone unaided by some foreign power.' The instances of oligarchial governments which are adduced by Mr. Greenidge himself go far to prove that during the greater part of the two centuries which he is chiefly considering, the fifth and the fourth, oligarchy, rather than democracy, was the prevalent form of government in Greece proper. It is significant that the 'persistence of oligarchic government' in states so typical as Corinth, Megara, and Sicyon should be pronounced 'astonishing.' This persistence is not to be explained simply by the support given by Sparta. In northern Greece there were oligarchies which were wholly independent of any support from without, and across the Aegean instances, such as Mitylene and Samos, prove that the rule of the few might endure, not only without the aid of external influences, but even in spite of them. Nor is the case quite so clear in the states south of the Isthmus as is here assumed. In the author's view, the strength of oligarchy in this region finds a sufficient explanation in the influence of the Peloponnesian League. Does not this position involve something like a *ὑστέρων πρότερον*? Might it not be maintained with equal plausibility that the permanence of the League finds its explanation in the strength of oligarchic sentiment in the states which composed it? If Mr. Greenidge's view is correct, oligarchy should have disappeared from the Peloponnese after the battle of Leuctra; as a matter of fact, within ten years of Leuctra, at the date of the battle of Mantinea, states so important as Elis, Corinth, and Achaia were still under oligarchic rule. The cases of Corinth and Achaia are instructive. At Corinth, where, after a brief spell of democracy, the restoration of oligarchy had been effected by Spartan influence in 387, the anti-popular party maintained itself in office long after Sparta had lost the power to coerce. The case of Achaia is even stronger. Here the democracy, which had been established by Thebes, was overthrown almost as soon as it was set up. It would appear then that there might be states, south of the Isthmus, and in the fourth century, in which democracy could only maintain its position when 'supported by the influence of a foreign power.'

In the treatment of the Spartan state the most noticeable feature is the prominence which is given to the account of the actual

working of the constitution. This is at once the most difficult, and the most interesting side of Spartan constitutional history, and Mr. Greenidge is to be congratulated upon the success which he has attained. The pages in which he describes the prerogatives of the kings, or discusses the relations of the ephorate to the gerousia, present a striking contrast to the treatment of such questions in the ordinary handbooks; they are eminently readable, and will help to correct one-sided views as to the part played both by the kings and the ephors in Spartan history.

Of the ninety pages which are allotted to the account of Athens half are occupied with the history of the constitutional changes, and the remainder is divided about equally between the working of the constitution, and the organisation of the empire and the confederacy. In the historical sections the estimate of Clisthenes' legislation is at once original and just, and the apology for sortition is written with some vigour. Is there, however, 'abundant evidence' that Attica in early times possessed a very mixed population? It is not, at any rate, to be discovered in the facts brought forward in these pages. The account of the working of the constitution is in some respects excellent, and will suggest new ideas to a good many readers. It is a pity, however, that the real value of this part of the handbook should be impaired by more than one lapse into the attractive fallacy of reading the present into the past. It is, of course, easy to produce a vivid impression upon the beginner's mind by calling Eubulus and Lycurgus Chancellors of the Exchequer, or by describing them as 'the great Chancellors of the century' (it is new to one, by the bye, that 'Chancellor' can stand for Chancellor of the Exchequer) but it is at the cost of suggesting a good deal more error than truth. When again the beginner is told that Cleon and Agyrrius were 'financial geniuses of a very high order,' is he not likely to carry away a somewhat false idea as to the comparative complexity of ancient and modern finance? Perhaps, however, one should be grateful to Mr. Greenidge for sparing us Beloch's verdict in all its native exaggeration. Most of all does one regret the intrusion of the 'Prime Minister' into the constitution of Athens in the person of the hypothetical president of the board of Strategi. No new arguments are brought forward in favour either of the hypothesis of a president, or of the analogy with a Prime Minister. It is true that both

the hypothesis and the analogy are more or less explained away, but the ordinary reader, I fear, is more likely to remember the suggestion that there was a Prime Minister at Athens than the qualifications by which that suggestion is rendered comparatively harmless.

With regard to the handbook as a whole, two criticisms suggest themselves. In the first place, in the desire to harmonise his authorities, Mr. Greenidge runs the risk of misleading his readers as to what those authorities state and what they do not state. On page 141, e.g., it is stated that in 479 a decree of the people, introduced by Aristides, changed the land census into a census of all property; a statement which is repeated twice over later on. True, in a note it is explained that this statement is based upon a hypothesis, but it is a serious matter, in a work intended for beginners, to put hypotheses and facts on a level in the text. The justification for this addition to the facts of Athenian constitutional history is, according to Mr. Greenidge, that it is the only mode of reconciling Plutarch and the *Athenaion Politeia*. If this were so, it would hardly be a conclusive reason for accepting the hypothesis; I imagine, however, that few will be ready to admit that Plutarch and the *Politeia* can be reconciled by this method. Plutarch says that a decree was passed by Aristides in 479, and that its effect was to open the archonship to all Athenians (κοινὴν εἶναι τὴν πολιτείαν καὶ τοῖς ἀρχοντας ἐξ Ἀθηναίων πάντων αἰεῖσθαι); the *Politeia*, on the other hand, knows of no decree in 479, and asserts that the archonship was not thrown open until 457, and that even then the Thetes were still excluded. The hypothesis in question, so far from proving both statements to be true, would prove both authorities to be wrong; the *Politeia*, because it ignores the decree of Aristides, and Plutarch, because he completely misconceives its purport. Or again, to take two other passages which directly bear upon this question. In the *Politics* (page 1304 A) there is the well-known statement that the services rendered by the Areopagus in the Persian wars brought about a conservative reaction, which was in its turn followed by a fresh development of the democracy, in consequence of the victory of Salamis. In the *Politeia* it is stated that the reputation gained by the Areopagus in its conduct of the war won for it seventeen years of supremacy, which lasted till the reform of Ephialtes in 462. Mr. Greenidge regards the relation between these two passages

as that of a summary account to a more detailed narrative. I find it difficult to follow him in this view. Do not the two passages imply two different and wholly inconsistent traditions? Both accounts, of course, agree in recognising an accession of influence to the Areopagus, followed by a fresh development of the democracy; the difficulty is to determine what event in the history of the Athenian constitution is referred to in the words τὴν δημοκρατίαν ἐσχηκότεραν ἐποίησεν, in the passage in the *Politics*. Is it the law of Ephialtes, or is it the decree of Aristides? Clearly, it cannot be both; either the decree of Aristides is ignored by the *Politics*, as it is by the *Politeia*, or else the reference in the *Politics* is to the decree of 479, and not to the reform of 462. I have never felt any hesitation in deciding for the latter alternative. A constitutional change in a democratic direction, which is the direct result of the victory of the ναυτιχὸς ὄχλος at Salamis, is in complete agreement with Plutarch's account of the matter; it is not easy to see how it can be explained by the success of Ephialtes in 462, or be harmonised with the theory of a conservative reaction, the force of which was not spent for seventeen years. In any case, if Mr. Greenidge is right in his view of the relation of the two passages, he cannot be right in the comparison which he draws between the democratic movement at Syracuse and the democratic movement at Athens. There is no parallel between the victory in the Great Harbour and the victory of Salamis, if in the one case Salamis was followed by seventeen years of an anti-democratic régime, and in the other a democratic revolution was the immediate consequence of the defeat of the Athenians. It need hardly be pointed out that, if the passage in the *Politics* be interpreted as a reference to the decree of Aristides (Plutarch's decree, not Mr. Greenidge's version of it), the parallel between Athens and Syracuse could hardly be closer. I will only point to one more instance of this tendency. On page 141 it is stated, in accordance with the *Politeia*, that the lot was not reinstituted for the appointment of archons until the year 487, yet, on the very page before, Herod. vi. 109 is referred to as proving the existence of the lot at Athens 'before the constitution could be described as democratic.' I am not quite sure what is the precise meaning to be attached to these last words, but that is immaterial. If the account in the *Politeia*, viz. that down to 487 the archons were αἰετοί, not κληρονομοί, is

accepted, the polemarch at the battle of Marathon cannot have been κληρωτός, so that the words in Herodotus, ὁ τῷ κνάμῳ λαχὼν πολεμαρχεῖν, can prove nothing as to the antiquity of sortition; all that they can prove is the inaccuracy of Herodotus.

The second criticism relates to the treatment of the fourth century. I am aware that in one of our Universities the belief is widely entertained that Greek history ends with the archonship of Euclides; it may seem therefore unreasonably exacting to demand that the fourth century should be put on a level with the fifth. I cannot, however, but regret to find, not only that, as it appears to me, the true importance of this century from a constitutional point of view is not brought out, but that there are passages which seem to suggest that its history has not inspired the author with the same interest, and that it has not been dealt with with the same care, as are displayed elsewhere in the handbook. More might have

been said about both the tyrannis and the Areopagus during this period, and so much is left unsaid at the beginning of the account of the Athenian Confederacy as to leave a misleading impression. In a second edition something should certainly be added to the account of the Olynthian league. A sketch of the league's history which ends with the statement that 'the league begun in 382 was dissolved in 379, and the path to Greece lay open to the Macedonian kings,' is likely to lead those readers very far astray indeed who possess no further knowledge of the fortunes of this confederacy. What, finally, one may fairly ask, would be thought, in the case of the fifth century, of the statement that the battle of the Eurymedon was fought in its concluding years! Yet, when it is only the fourth century that is in question, an event which belongs to the year 370, the σκυταλισμός at Argos, can be described as happening 'at its close.'

E. M. WALKER.

#### MCCOSH'S EDITION OF THE *BACCHIDES*.

*Plauti Bacchides*. Edited with Introduction, Commentary, and Critical Notes, by J. McCosh, M.A. London: Methuen and Co., 1896. 12s. 6d.

AN English edition of a play of Plautus not previously edited is something to be received with thankfulness, and this the first English edition of the *Bacchides* comes with all the advantages of clear type, good paper and wide margins. The editor states in his preface that 'where neither MSS. readings nor emendations of former editors can be admitted, owing to defect in sense or metre, one (*i.e.* presumably an emendation) has been proposed.' But the typography does not show where conjectures have been introduced into the text, nor does the Apparatus Criticus, in which Latin and English are sometimes curiously mixed. The editor states quite truly that 'it is difficult to refer students to a single, and at the same time a good, text for all the Comedies.' This difficulty has been removed now that we have Leo's new edition, not to speak of the complete Goetz and Schoell text in the Teubner series. But even when the editor was at work it was unnecessary to refer to so many editions as he has done—often two for a single play. This makes his references almost useless.

The edition has been prepared for no special class of students—'but the editor will be pleased if it is found useful to students who may have to read Plautus for an examination. It is believed that no point which a student of this poet ought to know has been passed over in the Introduction and the Notes.' The Introduction is long enough, but it contains non-essentials and omits essentials. There is nothing about Roman Comedy or the Roman Stage, no discussion of Plautus' treatment of his originals, no attempt to collect what is known about the original of this play and no sketch of the plot. There is an adequate life of Plautus, though the editor gives his name as 'Marcus Accius Plautus or Titus Maccius Plautus' and states his own preference for the former without any reference to Buecheler or other recent discussion of the subject. Some of the sections might be dispensed with, *e.g.* pp. viii.–xix. are mainly filled with the opinions of Pareus and others about the poet and with an attack on Horace, whose standpoint is not quite appreciated. Then comes an account of the MSS. and a list of editions. The sections on Metres and Prosody and Accent follow. The scansion is fully discussed, a long list of lines is given and the editor explains how he would scan them. There are plenty of instances and

plenty of statistics; the question is how far any principle would be made clear to a reader, and Mr. McCosh is perhaps at more pains to show the shortcomings of previous Plautinists, notably Bentley, than to state the facts concisely and perspicuously for beginners.

The notes are copious and contain a great deal of information that is good and useful, but there are observations that are inaccurate, others that are misleading, and some that seem to be unnecessary. For instance, on the opening words *converrite scopis* there are notes on the simple verb *verrere*, on the compound *converrere* and on *scopis* which ought to be unnecessary to any one who is able to read Plautus. As inaccurate or misleading take the notes on *ecquis* p. 83, '*ecquis*, *enquis* with *n* assimilated, a more emphatic form of the interrogative; "is there anyone to call?" "will some one call?"'; on *equidem* pp. 95-96, 'the *e* is evidently an abbreviation of *en* or *em* in Latin from which we get also *ecce*, the Greek *ἤν*, a particle of exclamation employed in calling attention' etc. Mr. McCosh admits that *equidem* is used with other persons than the first, but thinks that 'originally the particle was joined with the pers. pronoun of the first pers., which following the tendency of the classical languages was very often omitted, and that its application to other persons and numbers was gradually extended.' He does not mention *quando equidem*, *atque equidem* and so forth. Again on p. 97, '*quid ais*? "what have you to say?" This phrase either draws attention to a new point in the discourse or recalls the hearer to something which has been overlooked, the note disguises rather than

explains the real use of the idiom. On *amabo* = 'please' p. 91 and *qui* = 'how' p. 92 a tremendous list of references is given, some by lines, some by act and scene. No one believes more thoroughly than I do in references where a word or phrase can be elucidated thereby. But to give more than seventy references for *amabo* is to sow not with the hand but with the whole sack. It would surely have been enough to give three or four *in extenso* and then state, if the number is wanted, how many times Plautus uses the word! On p. 114 there is a long note on *nummus*. 'It will be observed that *nummus* is the general term for a coin in Latin and that coined money was generally computed in *drachmae* at Athens. Therefore the coin mentioned here was a gold piece the weight of two *drachmae*.' That *nummus* without an adjective where a definite coin is meant is the *didrachmon* is quite true, but Mr. McCosh does not quote the decisive passages and I am unable to follow the reasoning of the note as it stands. Such a note as that on *quid istic*? p. 200 does not explain the use of the idiom. There are misprints that need correction as Gaetz for Goetz twice in the preface, *ἔω* p. 83.

Mr. McCosh has many qualifications for his task. He has a genuine enthusiasm for his author and he has been unsparing of pains in the preparation of his edition. But while we may be thankful to him for what he has done, the book will need thorough revision and some excision before it can be pronounced to be a really good and satisfactory edition of the *Bacchides*.

J. H. GRAY.

Queen's College, Cambridge.

#### AN ITALIAN EDITION OF THE *ILIAD* AND *ODYSSEY*.

L'*ILIAD*e commentata da C. O. ZURETTI, Libro Primo, 1896 (pp. xxvii. 113; L. 1, 80), and

L'*ODISSEA* commentata da C. O. ZURETTI, Libro Primo, 1897 (pp. viii. 100; L. 1, 20).

Both in the *Collezione di Classici Greci e Latini con Note Italiane* published by Ermanno Loescher at Turin.

OF these two editions *Iliad* i. is intended for students whose knowledge of Greek is small, while by his edition of *Odyssey* i. the editor hopes to meet the needs of more advanced readers, and at the same time to

hasten the improvement in Greek studies in Italy, which he anticipates at no distant future. We wish him all success. He has paid great attention to etymology, and has acquainted himself with the results of Fick, Prellwitz and other 'Sprachforscher.' At the same time French scholarship has not been overlooked. The result is a polyglot edition of *Od.* i.; but the editor considers that French is intelligible to his readers, and wishes to inspire some of them with a desire to learn German: a daring experiment, for which no success could be expected in an English edition.

In the belief that the destructive criti-



cism of Vico, Wolf etc. has caused us to neglect unduly the ancient notions of Homer (È più nota, direi, la reazione che l'azione) he has prefixed to the *Iliad* two Greek lives of Homer, viz. that attributed to Herodotus, and one contained in a codex of the Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele at Rome. He would compare these with the legendary lives of the saints. But surely these lives of Homer are the very antithesis of, let us say, the Little Flowers of St. Francis, inasmuch as of popular legend they contain nothing, certainly next to nothing, but are vain fictions of grammarians. Nevertheless Zuretti has done well to make these lives better known, for their influence may be traced in classical literature. For instance, though the commentators on Plato seem not to have noticed the resemblance, the passage *Rep.* 398 A about refusing admittance to the imitative poet and sending him away anointed with myrrh, etc., its interpretation by the ancients as a reference to Homer, and the remarks of Dio Chrysostom and Aristides, that such was the honour paid to swallows, seem to find their explanation in such an account of the wanderings of Homer as is given in the life by 'Herodotus,' and

more particularly in the fragment of the *Εἰρσιώνη* = *Epigram* xv. Plato means, 'we will treat him with all respect and send him ἐρίῳ στέφαντες to sing his *εἰρσιώνη*, i.e. to beg, in another city.' The line

νεῦμαί τοι, νεῦμαι ἐνιαύσιος, ὥς τε χελιδὼν

shows that Dio and Aristides did not speak without book when they said that Plato meant to give Homer *χελιδόνος τιμήν*.

The type and paper of these editions is good, but misprints are far too common, and the line 'Virum mihi Camoena' etc. should surely not be assigned to Ennius. As the editor has paid so much attention to etymology, he may be glad to have brought before his notice (if he is not by now acquainted with it) Prellwitz' excellent derivation of *ἐνιαυτός* in the *Festschrift für Ludwig Friedlaender*, 1895. According to him *ἐνιαυτός* is properly the 'Jahrestag,' the day when the year (*ἔτος*) has come round to its starting point, and the world is once more ἐν αὐτῷ. *τελεισφόρον εἰς ἐνιαυτόν* (δ 86) = 'till the day which completes the old year, and begins the new.'

C. M. MULVANY.

## ARCHAEOLOGY.

### THE COLUMN OF AURELIUS.

*Die Marcussäule.* EUG. PETERSEN, A. VON DOMASZEWSKI, und G. CALDERINI. Mit cxxviii Tafeln. München, Bruckmann. 1896. M. 300.

THE last year has seen the publication of important works on three of the most important sculptured records of the Roman wars against the tribes of the North, the Column of Trajan, the Column of Aurelius, and the monument of Adamklissi. The reliefs of Adamklissi are published for the first time by Mr. Tocilescu with the help of Prof. Benndorf. The Column of Trajan had been adequately published in photographic plates by M. Froehner, but is now appearing in cheaper form under the editorship of Dr. C. Cichorius, with a subvention from the Saxon Government. The Column of Aurelius had hitherto been figured only in the very unsatisfactory engravings of Bartoli. Owing to financial assistance from the German Emperor, it has now been carefully surveyed and photographed; and

casts of the more important scenes have been taken.

Of the way in which the plates of Dr. Petersen's work are executed it would not be easy to speak too highly. They are admirable. As the relief of the figures is very high, they need to be seen from various points; and this is provided for by a system of overlapping plates, so that most of the figures are repeated. The text includes an introduction and a description of the plates by E. Petersen, and a discussion of their testimony by A. v. Domaszewski, an architectural chapter by G. Calderini, and a historical chapter by Th. Mommsen. It is unfortunate that the price of the work places it out of the reach of many; and yet it is to our credit that English institutions and individuals cannot afford to buy copies of books on the production of which the less wealthy Germans spend immense sums?

Compared with the noble Column of Trajan, that of Aurelius is in all ways inferior. Its material is poorer, Italian for

Parian marble; and this together with the height of its relief has caused its bad condition of surface. It has suffered greatly from injuries, repairs, and extensive restorations, one may rather call them bittings, of the most repulsive character. In design it imitates the Column of Trajan in many parts, and is always clumsy and jejune. And yet in some respects it is of unsurpassable interest: the antagonists have so great a claim on the modern world. On one side the great Emperor and his legions; on the other the German tribes who went by the names of the Suevi, Quadi, and Marcomanni, cousins of the Franks and the Saxons.

Prof. Mommsen observes that the written history of the wars of Marcus is so defective that we must go to the column for facts and read its scenes by their own light. The task is one which requires severe archaeological training. And hitherto, strangely enough, the sculptured records of the wars of our Teutonic ancestors have been inadequately studied by us. We have been content to call the adversaries of the Romans barbarians, not deciding accurately whether they are Celts or Germans, Dacians or Getae or Sarmatians. Prof. Furtwängler, in a vigorous though not convincing paper already noticed in these pages (*Intermezzi*; *C. R.* 1896, p. 446) has attempted to distinguish various barbarian types, and has herein done a service to science.

The interest of the Column of Aurelius lies partly in its depiction of Roman warfare, but more especially in its representation of German towns and German people. The impression which it gives us of the Suevi, Quadi, and Marcomanni is very favourable. It is evident that the war was a slow and indecisive one; and it seems to have ended rather in an agreement than a conquest. Germans serve as the bodyguard of Aurelius himself (Pl. 69); they often appear as the allies, as well as the enemies of the Romans (Pl. 115, etc.). The noble type of the German chiefs, with their long beards and dignified carriage, is unmistakable. They know how to be beheaded without losing courage. Even their women when captured do not give way, nor exhibit the dulness of the Sarmatian women, but maintain a certain dignity. In the scenes the contrasted types of German, Celt, Sarmatian and Scyth are preserved. The Sarmatians are demonstrative and vivacious, with unkempt hair, and low foreheads. Their physical type, resembling that of the Russian peasant, indicates their Slavonic race. The Celts (Pl. 77) are identified by the torques: they have

prominent nose and chin, wide mouth and wrinkled forehead, a type notably less noble than the German. It is interesting to notice that in the cold forests of the north German ordinary men wore no more clothing than a pair of breeches, and a short cloak fastened on the shoulder. The chiefs were more warmly clad: and the devotion of the people to them seems to have impressed the Romans: in several cases the clansmen are represented on the column as throwing away their lives, in order to allow their leaders to escape.

The parallelism of the scenes of the Column of Aurelius to those of the Trajan Column diminishes the value of the former as a historic document. In both a great figure of Victory appears on the front, half way up. On the Trajan column, it divides the first from the second Dacian war. It may be doubted whether Dr. v. Domaszewski is right in supposing that on the Aurelius Column it divides the Marcomannic from the Sarmatian war, since the Sarmatians come in before we reach the Victory.

The most generally interesting scenes of the Column are those which depict the intervention of the gods on behalf of the Romans. In the legendary early history of Christianity that intervention plays a large part, and it is generally supposed that the Column lends countenance to those traditions. But an impartial consideration of the reliefs shows that this is scarcely the case. In one scene (Pl. 17), where a Roman fortification is undergoing a siege, the wooden constructions of the besiegers are overthrown and burned by a thunderbolt. In another scene, belonging to a later stage of the war (Pl. 21 and foll.) we see the Rain-god with wide dripping wings spread above Romans and Quadi. To the Romans he brings relief: men and horses drink eagerly, having clearly suffered from drought. At the same time the inundation of water sweeps away men and beasts on the side of the Germans. The Romans are depicted as journeying through a mountainous country when they are refreshed by the rain; but some fighting is going on in the lower part of the relief, and it even looks as if the Quadi were being driven into the stream by the legions. Dr. v. Domaszewski observes that this is in close accord with the statements of Dion; this, however, is not altogether the case. Dion, according to his epitomizer, narrated (71, 8) how the legions were hemmed in by the Quadi, cut off from water, and reduced to great straits, when by divine intervention an extraordinary storm broke, bringing

abundant rain to the Romans, but overwhelming their enemies with lightning. The credit of the intervention was given by Dion to Arnuphis, an Egyptian priest; but it was claimed by the Christians for the prayers of their co-religionists in the army. It is clear that on the Column nothing is recorded but ordinary heavy rain; but Dion sets rolling the snowball of miraculous narrative which soon attains great proportions. Dion, as is known, had a great liking for portents and miracles.

I have not criticized the execution of the volumes before us, for the simple reason that there is no opportunity for criticism. The plates are, as I have already observed, admirable. The text is brief, clear, and very satisfactory. It is greatly to be hoped that the proper publication of the sculptured memorials of the Roman wars will induce well equipped scholars to move further on the lines initiated by Petersen, Benndorf, and Furtwängler, and bring to the aid of history and ethnography the results of their careful observations of Roman sculpture. As Dr. Petersen points out, while the art of the Column of Trajan is like its material Greek, the art of the later column is Roman. And Roman work, being less under the dominion of style than that of the Greeks, is more to be trusted in matters of fact. It is possible too that our records of German wars may go back further than we think. As Prof. Furtwängler shows, the Bastarnæ were at first regarded by the Greeks as a Gaulish tribe, and Polybius accepts them as such; but Pliny and Tacitus know that they were German. Is it not then highly probable that some of the tribes which overran Macedonia in the third century B.C., and gave rise to the Pergamene school of art, were also not Gaulish but Teutonic? There is evidently here an opening for further investigation.

Meantime there is a great need, especially in England, for bringing these sculptured records into connexion with the teaching of Roman history. In interest they are second only to the Bayeux tapestry, and in art incomparably superior to that work. The photographs of the column of Trajan, at all events, are now placed within the reach of schoolmasters and college lecturers. It is a pity that the cast of that column which exists in the South Kensington Museum is so placed that it is impossible to see more than a small part of it. Both of the columns are of more historical and scientific value than the far more beautiful productions of the best Greek art; and the liberality of the

German governments has laid them open for general use.

PEPCY GARDNER.

#### GARDNER ON GREEK SCULPTURE.

*A Handbook of Greek Sculpture.* By E. A. GARDNER. Part II., (Macmillan's Handbooks of Archaeology and Antiquities). 5s.

THE good qualities which were conspicuous in the first part of Prof. Gardner's Handbook are as characteristic of the second, and it is not too much to say that the whole book easily takes rank before all other English elementary treatises on Greek sculpture. This part covers the history of the subject from the decorative sculptures of the Parthenon to Græco-Roman and Roman times.

The literature relating to the Parthenon is so large that an attempt to give an account of the metopes, pediments, and frieze in less than thirty pages must suffer from compression and omission. Thus of the 'Victory,' which now stands with the sculptures of the East pediment, we are not told that there are strong reasons for supposing that it does not belong to the East pediment at all. There is some excuse for the fact that Furtwängler's theory of the interpretation of the angle figures of the West pediment is passed over in silence, although Collignon has adopted it. On the whole, Prof. Gardner is most cautiously conservative in his interpretations; but he sometimes carries his caution a little too far, as when he says of the male figure still *in situ* in the West pediment, which has been supposed to be either Cecrops or Asclepius, that 'neither theory is as yet convincingly proved.' It would have been less disheartening to the beginner had he been told to regard it as one of the two. For the central group of the East frieze, Prof. Gardner adopts, as 'perhaps more probable' than other solutions, the suggestion that the priest is folding up and putting away the old peplos of Athena to make place for the new one which was to be brought her. This explanation certainly does not solve all difficulties, but it is at least better than the 'carpet' theory, which Prof. Gardner judiciously ignores. I have elsewhere dealt with this point (*Class. Rev.* 1894 p. 225), but I may be allowed to repeat that as the procession has not yet arrived at the place where the central figures are standing, the garment

in question cannot be the new peplos; not to mention the fact that it is being folded up instead of unfolded.<sup>1</sup> The choice lies between the old peplos and the priest's himation or some other piece of cloth. To the objection that the new peplos, on this theory, would not be represented anywhere on the frieze, it may be replied that neither is the statue of the goddess herself represented. For decorative purposes, the representation of the procession was the main object; the rest could be done by mere suggestion.

To pass to another monument, we are told that the Nereid tomb falls 'in all probability' within the limits of the fifth century. Nevertheless it is admitted in a note that it may yet be connected with the Lycian prince Perikles. Now, if coins prove anything, then those issued by Perikles prove that his reign belongs to the fourth century; so that the association is a difficult matter.

But is the tomb really of the fifth century? Are not the figures of the Nereids, for instance, just such as a provincial artist would have produced, working in the fourth century from models of an earlier period? Whatever the truth may be, it is worth while remembering that there is no imperative necessity to connect the tomb with Perikles. The association was probably first suggested by the fact that Perikles is the only Lycian prince—after Kubernis—whose name has come down to us in literature. But we know from the Lycian coinage that there were other princes reigning in Lycia towards the close of the fifth century, by one of whom the Nereid monument may well have been erected.

With Prof. Gardner's placing of the various monuments, as regards their artistic value, it is usually difficult to disagree. One statement, however, is somewhat unfortunate. We are told that in the Mausoleum reliefs 'the wonderful variety prevents any hint of repetition, even in detail.' In view of the well-known slab from Genoa, where the parallelism of lines suggests a problem in Euclid, this praise is astonishing.

It is unwise to speak of the Sidon sarcophagi without having seen the originals; but of one point it is possible to judge from reproductions, and certainly the faults of composition in which the reliefs abound would seem to show that the praise bestowed upon them is not very well deserved.

The book contains very few minor errors.

<sup>1</sup> It has indeed been suggested by Collignon that the garment is being folded in order that it may be carried into the temple. This solves the latter, but not the former of the difficulties mentioned.

The terra-cotta statuette of the Diadumenos mentioned on p. 349, note 2, is not, we believe, in the British Museum. 'Ανθρωπόποιος and ἀνδριαντόποιος are oddly accentuated. But there are few books of the kind which can be so freely recommended as Prof. Gardner's.

G. F. HILL.

#### MEMPHIS AND MYCENAE.

In his note, *supra*, pp. 128 ff., Mr. Myres has alluded to the fact that he sent me a proof of his review, and that I sent him a memorandum in reply. In sending me the proof, he stated that his object was to avoid controversy as far as possible, 'at all events on matters of fact'; and I devoted the greater part of my memorandum to what I conceived to be matters of fact. But he made hardly any alteration in the proof.

For example, there is his assertion that certain dates 'will not work out on any hypothesis but that of a year of 365 days.' It is simply a matter of arithmetic that they will not work out on that hypothesis: see above, pp. 79, 80. Or again there are his remarks about the coffin of Pinetchem's grandson. In these he represents the book as saying exactly the reverse of what it does say: see above, pp. 76, 77. I called his attention to both these points, but he made no alteration.

In one instance he attempts to justify his statements. On pp. 452, 453 of his review he asserted that my chronology was founded on 'a continuous genealogy' of 'fifteen generations'; adding that 'six of them are in the female line,' and that 'fully half of the children in this list were not eldest sons,' and also discussing 'the birth-to-birth average of parental ages.' He published these assertions in spite of what I told him in my memorandum. And now he says in his note, p. 129:—'When a writer fills page after page with statements that A, father of B, married C, daughter of D, and so forth, a reviewer may be pardoned if he thinks that a genealogy is intended.' But this is not to the point. It is not a question of 'a genealogy' at large, but of a definite genealogy of fifteen generations of which he gave particulars; and this genealogy is not to be extracted from the statements in the book.

He also writes as follows, p. 129:—'On the origin of Queen Thii, my criticism was that Mr. Torr had committed either a logical



fallacy or a grammatical confusion. His retort is to print my sentence halved, and adorned with italics of his own.' In his review, p. 450, he gave his version of my statement, adding 'But, in syllogistic form, "some foreigners are not Greeks."' In my reply, p. 78, I gave my own version of my statement, adding 'Mr. Myres' comment is:—"But, in syllogistic form, *some foreigners are not Greeks.*"' The reader will perceive that I did not print the sentence halved, as Mr. Myres asserts; and that, where I employed italics, Mr. Myres had himself employed inverted commas.

I told him in my memorandum that I had never suggested that Queen Thii was a Greek, and called his attention very pointedly to what I had said about her origin. But the only alteration that he made, was to qualify the words 'He [Mr. Torr] also thinks' with a foot-note:—"Unless 'this region' and 'that region' in the same sentence refer to the same country; which would be very queer English.' I believe that it is perfectly good English to change from 'this' to 'that' on passing from the first clause to the second in a sentence of that form. But even if this sentence were ambiguous, when taken by itself, the context would remove all doubt.

It is surely a very strong measure for a reviewer to attack an author for holding certain views, when he has got a memorandum from the author telling him that those are not the author's views. But this is what Mr. Myres has done in that review of his; and not merely in two or three places, but in many. And that, I think, is a question that concerns the management of this journal. For if this were a matter that could be taken seriously, and the *Classical Review* were going to be sued for a libel, there would be a difficulty in setting up the defendants' plea of 'fair comment.'

There are some other points in Mr. Myres' note which call for a reply.

On the Crete question he says:—"Mr. Torr ingeniously rearranges his quotation." In quoting two consecutive paragraphs I let the quotation run straight on, instead of starting the second paragraph in a fresh line. There was no other rearrangement. Then he says that I have omitted some words in another quotation. The omission was indicated by the usual dots. And then he says that my 'statement that Mr. Evans' book has no appendix is a verbal quibble.' His citation was, 'Evans, *Cretan Pictographs*, 1895, Appendix; cf. p. 57.' And the book

NO. CXVI. VOL. XI.

has no Appendix. If he chooses to call the final chapter an Appendix, when it is not called so in the book itself, he ought not to grumble at being misunderstood.

On the Tell el-Amarna question he says that, in setting out the evidence, I have omitted a vital fact. What he calls a 'fact,' is really a couple of assertions,  $\alpha$  that the Ægean potsherds were intermingled with Egyptian potsherds 'in such a way that subsequent admixture is out of the question,' and  $\beta$  that the Egyptian potsherds are of the XVIIIth Dynasty. As I have said before, I believe that both these assertions are without foundation.

On the Kahun question he speaks of misquotation and misrepresentation. In his review, p. 448, he said that Mr. Petrie 'distinctly states (*Illahun*, p. 10) that they [the potsherds] are neither Naukratite nor of any later style known to him.' I naturally supposed that he was referring to the passage on p. 10 where Mr. Petrie speaks of the Naukratite pottery as 'well known to us,' and then refers to 'any later period.' Of course I quite accept his statement that he was referring to another passage. But I must confess that I am puzzled; for in this other passage Mr. Petrie speaks only of 'historic pottery,' and does not mention Naukratite at all.

On the Vaphio question he says:—"A more candid critic would have added that the whole tenor of the *Times* article is to attribute the Mykenæan necropolis at Kurion to a date below 700: and that 700 is the highest date specifically mentioned.' He cited the *Times* on the Vaphio question, and I showed what it really said about that question. If he had cited it on the Kurion question, I would have mentioned what it said of that; but he did not cite it for anything except the Vaphio question.

I cannot help thinking that these imputations of want of candour, and so forth, ought not to have been made upon such very slender grounds.

CECIL TORR.

[Surely the difference is one of opinion on questions of archaeology, regarding which some day, perhaps, 'securus iudicabit orbis.' Mr. Torr's Memorandum was carefully considered, and it still seems to me that the remarks of the Reviewer do not put statements into Mr. Torr's mouth which he repudiated, but deny in certain cases the correctness or the relevancy of his argument.

T

However, the matter has been stated sufficiently for readers to form their own opinion.

As regards the last paragraph of Mr. Torr's Note, I am sure that no intentional want of candour was imputed, and I regret that any words used should seem to bear that meaning.—Ed.]

### MONTHLY RECORD.

#### ITALY.

*S. Pietro Montagnon (Venetia).*—An interesting tombstone has been found, with an axe, a plummet, a trumpet, and a flute engraved on the tympanum. The inscription runs: Q'APPEVS'AVGV|RINVS'Q'APPEO|EVTYCHIANO'PA|TRI'OPTIMO ET'CE|SERNIA.NICEPO|RIS MARITO DVN|CISSIMO'CA-A-MAV|AE'APONESI|V V F.

The word *καλαμαύλης* for a piper occurs in Athenaeus (176 D).

*Aponesi* refers to the town of Aquae Aponi.<sup>1</sup>

*Bologna.*—In April 1896 a pavement was discovered in the garden of the Palazzo Albergati, which stands on the supposed site of the *Thermae* of Augustus. The pavement is of black and white mosaic with decorative patterns, apparently of late date. There are no traces of adjoining walls or buildings, and everything points to its belonging not to a public edifice but to a private house. Hence the view that this is the site of the *Thermae* is probably wrong, and they must be sought for on the site where the pavements were discovered, mentioned in the Monthly Record for May 1893 (*C. R.* vii. p. 229).<sup>2</sup>

*Pitigliano, Etruria.*—The site of an Etruscan *pagus* with its cemetery has come to light. The tombs are of two types, known as a *cassone* and a *camera*; one is very elaborate, with a vestibule and three large chambers, one of which contains four large sarcophagi. Among the contents of tombs were several varieties of pottery, including common black-glazed vases; red-glazed vases, one with geometrical patterns and rude figures of horses; an amphora of Rhodian type with two friezes of running panthers divided by a lotos-pattern; Proto-Corinthian *lekythi*; and ordinary *bucchero* ware.<sup>3</sup>

*Tortoreto (Picenum).*—A hoard of coins has been found here, consisting of: cast coins: six unciae, mostly with an astragalus on the obv.; 179 coins of Campanian fabric (*nomine Romanorum*); eleven coins of Roman mintage; and 51 from provincial mints, at Neapolis, Cales, Cosa, etc.<sup>3</sup>

*Sala Consilina (Lucania).*—Part of a Geometrical vase of Italian fabric has been found; it is decorated in panels like the *Dipylon* vases, with swastikas and diaper patterns; but for technical reasons cannot be of Greek origin.<sup>3</sup>

*Tarentum.*—A treasure of silver vases has come to light. The finest piece is a plate with busts of a youthful *Satyr* and a *Maenad* embracing, in high relief in the centre; the composition is fine and the workmanship excellent. Besides this may be mentioned a *pyxis* with three figures in relief on the top, resembling the compositions on Italian mirror-cases; the figures are much oxidised and cannot be identified with certainty, but one appears to be *Nike*; two *canthari* and a

stand for a vase; three small feet (of a *cista*?) in the form of *Sirens*; two handles of vases, and fragments of a vase with scale-pattern chased on the exteriors.

*Reggio.*—A bronze stamp in the form of a ship has been found here, inscribed GAVDET, which appears to be meant for GAVDENTI (cf. *C.I.L.* x. 8059, 176-177; this would of course be a proper name, *Gaudentius*); GAVDEAS, as a salutation, also occurs (*C.I.L.* x. 8059, 497 and an example in *Brit. Mus.*).<sup>3</sup>

#### BALKAN PENINSULA.

*Konjica, Herzegovina.*—In February last a sanctuary of *Mithras* was excavated, being the first of the kind to turn up in the Balkan Peninsula. It throws light on many important details in connection with the arrangement of such sanctuaries. The most important find was an altar with reliefs on the two long sides; on the front is the sacrifice of the bull, with a dedicatory inscription; on the back, the sacrificial feast. The reliefs were so placed that they could be seen from both sides; they supply many details to fill up gaps in our knowledge of the *Mithras* cult. That they are of local make is indicated by the fact that the stone can be identified as coming from a neighbouring quarry.<sup>4</sup>

#### AFRICA.

*Timgad, Algeria.*—The French excavations here are making good progress, and several buildings of the Antonine epoch have been found, including the Capitol, with statues of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva; the *Thermae* with hot, cold, and tepid rooms; and assembly rooms, in which the arrangements for warming are still visible under the pavements. The forum is one of the most interesting known, with remarkable columns. Of the theatre there are considerable remains in the middle of the city; it accommodated three or four thousand. The places for the upper classes and officials in the orchestra can still be identified, and the wall of the stage and other smaller details are well preserved.<sup>4</sup>

H. B. WALTERS.

#### Revue Numismatique. Part iv. 1896.

J. Rouvier. 'Une métropole phénicienne oubliée: Laodicée, métropole de Canaan.' (concluded).—E. Babelon. 'Médaillon d'or de Gallien et de Salonine.' A large gold medallion, of the weight of ten aurei, lately acquired by the Bibliothèque nationale. It came from Egypt where it had been used by a fellah as an amulet. Obv. CONCORDIA AVGG. Bust of Gallienus and Salonina. Rev. PIETAS FALERI. Beneath a tree, a goat suckling a child; another child and an eagle are near the goat; in the exergue, a thunderbolt. The goat is explained as *Amaltheia*. The two children are Jupiter *Dijovis* and *Vejovis*, worshipped at *Falerii*. The 'Pietas Faleri' and the 'Virtus Faleri' (on a bronze coin of Gallienus) recall the virtues of the giant *Valerius* or *Valens*, the ancestor of the *Gens Valeria* from which Gallienus boasted his descent. The medallion was probably struck in A.D. 262, a year of plague and political disaster.—*Necrologie.* Alexandre Boutkowski who died at Paris 26, Oct., 1896 was possessed of considerable stores of numismatic lore, but he was an uncritical and often inaccurate worker. His *Dictionnaire Numismatique* and *Petit Mionnet* contain some useful references but have to be used with the utmost caution.

<sup>1</sup> *Notizie dei Lincei*, August 1896.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, July 1896.

<sup>3</sup> *Notizie dei Lincei*, Sept. 1896.

<sup>4</sup> *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 13 March 1897.

*Revue belge de Numismatique* (Bruxelles) for 1896.  
M. C. Soutzo. Poids antiques autonomes de  
Tomis. p. 389 ff.

*Zeitschrift für Numismatik* (Berlin). Vol. xx.  
parts 3 and 4 (1897).

F. Quilling. 'Ausgewählte römische Münzen und Medaillen de städtischen Münzsammlung in Frankfurt a. M.'—A. Von Sallet. 'Silbermünze eines baktrischen Königs Antiochus.'—E. Pernice. 'Ueber den Wert der monumentalen und litterarischen Quellen über Metrologie.'—E. J. Seltmann. 'Unerdachte römische Kaisermünzen.'—F. Imhoof-Blumer. 'Zur Münzkunde des Pontos, von Paphlagonien, Tenedos, Aiolis und Lesbos.' *Amisos*. The Tyche of the city is seen seated with her rudder placed on a small head which has been called Sarapis, Zeus or Gaia. The head has horns or rather perhaps crab's claws attached to it, and it is suggested that Thalassa or the Pontos Euxeinos is represented. Similar representations of Thalassa are cited at Laodicea in Phrygia, Perinthos and Korykos. *Komana* (Pontus). Representations of the Goddess Ma or Enyo with her club. *Sebasteia on the Halys (Sivas)*. A coin of Valerian inscribed [CE]BACTHΝΩΝ is attributed to this town: it is dated from an era beginning, probably, B.C. 2-1. *Aboniteichos Ionopolis*. A coin of Trebonianus Gallus, reverse ΖΕΦΥΡΙΣ ΙΩΝΟΠΟΛΕΙΤΩΝ naked male figure standing with right arm raised, apparently a representation of the West Wind (Ζέφυρος for Ζέφυρος). *Amastris*. Rev. Hermes holding caduceus and discus. The latter attribute of Hermes had not previously been recognized on coins. *Haimilion*. Bronze coins, circ. B.C. 63, inscribed ΑΙΜΙΑΙΟΥ and apparently issued by a Paphlagonian or Pontic town Αἰμίλιον or Αἰμίλιος. *Tenedos*. Reverse-type with the double-axe repre-

sented on a kind of stand. On another specimen an amphora is attached to the double-axe by a taenia. By these representations, it is rendered probable that the πέλεκυς was a sacred object, preserved possibly in the temple of Tenes. *Aigai* (Aeolis). Bronze coin of the time of Titus and Domitian. The magistrate Apollonios has the title Νεμεονίκης i.e. Victor in the Nemean Games; cp. 'Ολυμπιονίκης on a coin of Philadelphia. *Kyme* (Aeolis). Representations of the Kymaean Sibyll. *Methymna*. Head of Dionysos φαλλήν. *Mytilene*. Two additions to the numismatic 'Portraits of famous citizens of Mytilene' published by me in the *Classical Review* for May 1894, pp. 226, 227; cp. Brit. Mus. Catal. *Troas, Aeolis and Lesbos*, p. lxx. ff. Obverse CEITOC NEOC MAP-[KOY ?] Head of the younger Sextus. Reverse.

ΑΝΔΡΟΜΕΔΑ ΝΕΑ ΛΕΣΒΩ (νακτος). Head of the younger Andromeda. These personages are not elsewhere mentioned. This Sextus (son of Marcus?) appears to be distinct from Sextus ἥρων of other Mytilenaeans coins. Andromeda is probably his wife, and daughter of Lesbos ἥρων νέος who, according to Imhoof-Blumer's view, is distinct from Lesbos the philosopher.—H. Gaebler. 'Zur Münzkunde Macedoniens II. Die Münzen der Derronen.' Describes an unpublished coin with the inscription ΔΕΡΡΟΝΙΚΟΝ (retrograde), i.e. money (ἀργύριον) of the Derroni. Hitherto, coins of this class have been supposed to bear the name of an unknown dynast Derronikos. Dr. Gaebler suggests that the Derroni dwelt in the peninsula of Sithonia (Chalcidice). Their coins resemble in style and fabric the early sixth century coins of the Bisaltae and other Thracio-Macedonian peoples.—A. Von Sallet. A note on forged Greek coins (p. 326), referring to the false coin of 'Aerminas' and to various forgeries in the Bactrian series (Archebius and Philoxenus etc.).

WARWICK WROTH.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

*Journal of Philology*. Vol. xxv. No. 49.  
1897.

*Note on Rigeada* i. 48 (Hymn to the Dawn), 15, L. Horton-Smith. *Plato's Later Theory of Ideas*, J. Llewelyn Davies. A criticism of Dr. Jackson's papers under this title, and partly of Mr. Archer Hind's editions of the *Phaedo* and *Timaeus*. Notes on *Aristotle's Politics* Book I., A. Platt. *Emendationes Homericae* (II. xiii.-xviii.), T. L. Agar. Emendations are proposed in the following passages, N 62, 256, ε 456, O 645, 710, Π 259, 352, P 481, 570, ε 485, 582. *Tibulliana*, J. P. Postgate. Critical notes on various passages. *Plato's Later Theory of Ideas*, H. Jackson. This is the seventh paper, and is directed against Zeller's theory that the *Philebus* is prior to the *Republic*. Dr. Jackson deals with Zeller's two chief points, (1) the controversy about the Good, and (2) the theory of true and false pleasures. *Passages in the Poetae Lyrici*, H. Richards. *On a Fragment of Solon*, R. C. Jebb. This is an answer to Prof. Platt's criticism (in the last no. of the *Journal of Philology*) on the opening verses of the iambic fragment of Solon in Sandys' edition of the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*. *On the place*

occupied by Odysseus in *Od.* xxi., H. Hayman. Maintains that the difficulty of Prof. Platt in his article 'The Slaying of the Suitors' [see Cl. Rev. ix. 477] turns on the erroneous assumption that there was only one *ἄλσος οὐδός* opening upon the *μέγαρον*. *The Site of the Battle of Lake Trasimene*, B. W. Henderson. On a balancing of probabilities after a personal examination of the rival sites, the writer inclines to the opinion that the battle was fought in the defiles between Passignano and Montecolognola and not on the Tuoro site. *ἱερός, ἱερός, ἱός*, C. M. Mulvany. Recommends a derivation from \**σι-ρός* = (1) 'fast' (cf. *fastness* = *fortress*) and (2) 'religiously fixed.' The second meaning nearly coincides with the meaning 'sacred' developed by \**(σ)αρός*, whence arose confusion of *ἱός* and \**ἱερός*, and extension of the aspirate giving *ἱερός*. *Catulliana*, H. Macnaghten. Critical notes on some passages. *Horace Odes* iv. 8, A. W. Verrall. Maintains that whether Mr. Stanley's explanation of ll. 15-20 [see last no. of *Journal of Philology* and Cl. Rev. x. 380] is correct or not, these six lines are an interpolation.

## LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

## ENGLISH AND AMERICAN BOOKS.

- Augustini de Catechizandis Rudibus.* Edited by Rev. W. Yorke Fausset. Post 8vo. 122 pp. Methuen & Co. 3s. 6d.
- Boissier* (G.) Cicero and his Friends, a Study of Roman Society in the Time of Caesar, translated by A. D. Jones. Crown 8vo. 408 pp. Innes. 5s.
- Boughton* (W.) History of Ancient Peoples. With Illustrations and Map. 12mo. New York. 9s.
- Cicero.* Letters to Atticus. Book I., with Notes by A. Pretor. 3d ed. with Appendix. 12mo. 156 pp. Bell. (Public School Series.) 4s. 6d.
- Concordance to the Greek New Testament according to the texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf and the English Revisers. Ed. by W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden. 4to. 1050 pp. Half calf, Edinburgh, Clark. £1 11s. 6d.
- Hatch* (E.) Greek Ideas and Usages, their Influence upon the Christian Church. Ed. by A. M. Fairbairn. (Hibbert Lecture 1888.) 6th Edition. 8vo. 384 pp. Williams and Norgate. 3s. 6d.
- Juvenal.* Satires VIII., X., XVI. Translated with test papers on Satires XI., XIII., XIV. Crown 8vo. 63 pp. Clive. 2s. 6d.
- Satires XI. XIII., XIV., edited by A. H. Allcroft. Introduction, Text, Notes. Crown 8vo. 76 pp. Clive. 3s. 6d.
- Murray* (G.) Ancient Greek Literature: a History. Crown 8vo. 428 pp. Heinemann. 6s.
- Ovidius.* Anderson, J. N., On the Sources of Ovid's *Heroides* I, III, VII, X, XII. 8vo. 140 pp.
- Philip and Alexander of Macedon. Two Essays in Biography. By David G. Hogarth. 8vo. xii, 305 pp.; with map and illustrations. Murray. 14s.
- Texts and Studies. Vol. V. No. 1. Apocrypha Anecdota II. By M. R. James. 8vo. sewed. Cambridge Press. 7s. 6d. net.
- Tsountas* (C.) and (J. T.) *Manatt*, The Mycenaean Age, a Study of the Monuments and Culture of Pre-Homeric Greece. With an Introduction by Dr. Dörpfeld. 4to. 450 pp. Macmillan. £1 4s.
- Virgil.* *Eneid*, Book XII., edited by A. H. Allcroft and F. G. Plaistow. Introduction, Text, Notes. Crown 8vo. 93 pp. Clive. 1s. 6d.
- The Eclogues. Translated into English Hexameter Verse. By the Right Hon. Sir George Osborne Morgan. 4to. xv, 48 pp. Frowde. 4s. 6d. net.

## FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Διοσχόλου δράματα σωζόμενα καὶ ἀπολωλότων ἀποσπάσματα μετὰ ἐξηγητικῶν καὶ κριτικῶν σημειώσεων τῇ συνεργασίᾳ Εὐγενίου Ζωμαρίδου ἐκδιδόμενα ὑπὸ Ν. Wecklein.* Vol. II., III., part 1. 8vo. vii, 798 pp. 12 M.
- Aristoteles.* Maier (H.) Die Syllogistik des Aristoteles. I. Die logische Theorie des Urteils bei Aristoteles. 8vo. iv, 214 pp. Tübingen.
- Ausonius.* Poèmes divers d'Ausone, traduits par Ed. Ducoté. 16mo. v, 192 pp. Paris.
- Brunn* (Heinr.) Griechische Kunstgeschichte. Nachgelassene Theile, herausgegeben von A. Flasch. Vol. II. Die archaische Kunst. 8vo. xi, 281 pp. Munich, Verlagsanstalt. 7 M. 50.
- Bussoll* (G.) Griechische Geschichte bis zur Schlacht bei Chaeroneia. Vol. III., Pt. 1. Die Pentekontaetie. xxii, 592 pp. Gotha, Perthes. 10 M.
- Cagnat* (R.) L'Année épigraphique, revue des publications épigraphiques relatives à l'antiquité romaine (1896.) 8vo. 48 pp. Paris.
- Catullus.* Vahlen (J.) De Valerii Catulli carminibus (II.) 4to. 18 pp. Berlin.
- Dio Chrysostomus.* Wegehaupt (J.) De Dione Chrysostomo Xenophontis sectatore. 8vo. 86 pp. Göttingen.
- Epictetus.* Bruns (J.) De schola Epicteti. 8vo. 23 pp. Kiel.
- Euripides.* Wecklein (N.) Beiträge z. Kritik des Euripides. II. 8vo. 90 pp. München.
- Gregorius Nyssenus.* Reiche (A.) Die künstlerischen Elemente in der Welt- und Lebens-Anschauung des Gregor von Nyssa. 8vo. 60 pp. Jena.
- Hufmayr* (P. E.) Die pseudocyprianische Schrift: De Pascha Computus. 8vo. 40 pp. and table. Würzburg.
- Lattmann* (H.) De conjunctivo latino. 8vo. 48 pp. Ilfeld.
- Linden* (E.) De bello civili Sullano. 8vo. 68 pp. Freiburg.
- Lorichius.* Schröder (E.) Joannis Lorichii Hadamarii Jobus comedia (ed. Marburg a. 1543) denuo edita. 4to. 26 pp. Marburg.
- Lucretius.* Hildén (C. J.) De casuum syntaxi Lucretiana. I. 8vo. 112 pp. Helsingfors.
- Ovidius.* Krassowsky (W.) Ovidius quomodo in isdem fabulis enarrandis a se ipso discreperit. 8vo. 38 pp. Königsberg. 1 M.
- Pherekydes.* Diels (H.) Zur Pentemychos des Pherekydes. (Aus "Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin".) 8vo. 13 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 50 Pf.
- Philo.* Krell (E.) Philo, περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαίου εἶναι ἐλεῦθερον, die Echtheitsfrage. 8vo. 38 pp. Augsburg.
- Plato.* Ritter, Platos Politicus. Beiträge zu seiner Erklärung. 4to. 32 pp. Ellwangen.
- Posidonius.* Hultsch (F.) Poseidonios über die Grösse und Entfernung der Sonne. 4to. 48 pp., engravings. Göttingen.
- Ridder.* (A.) de, De cetypis quibusdam aeneis quae falso vocantur "Argivocorinthiaca." 8vo. vi, 92 pp. Paris.
- Schömann* (G. F.) Griechische Alterthümer. 4th Ed. by J. H. Lipsius. Vol. I: Das Staatswesen. 8vo. viii, 600 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 12 M.
- Schöne* (Alfr.) Über die Ironie in der griechischen Dichtung, insbesondere bei Homer, Aeschylus und Sophocles. 8vo. 23 pp. Kiel. 1 M. 40.
- Seneca.* Mücke (K.) De praestantia codicis Uelcensis in priore parte epistularum Senecae philosophi recensenda. 8vo. 16 pp. Ilfeld.
- Summa (W.) Symbolae criticae ad Senecae tragoedias. 8vo. 34 pp. Neustadt.
- Vandarie* (H.) L'Optatif grec. Essai de syntaxe historique. 8vo. xxv, 260 pp. Paris.
- Xenophon Ephesius.* Mann (E.) Ueber den Sprachgebrauch des Xenophon Ephesius. 8vo. 41 pp. Kaiserslautern.